Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa Dri-med 'od-zer

The Full-Fledged *Khyung-chen* Bird

An Essay in Freedom as the Dynamics of Being

Edited, translated, and annotated by

Herbert Guenther

Studia Philologica Buddhica
Occasional Paper Series
X

Tokyo · The International Institute for Buddhist Studies · 1996

The Full-Fledged *Khyung-chen* Bird

Studia Philologica Buddhica
Occasional Paper Series
X

Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa Dri-med 'od-zer

The Full-Fledged *Khyung-chen* Bird

An Essay in Freedom as the Dynamics of Being

Edited, translated, and annotated by

Herbert Guenther

Tokyo
The International Institute for Buddhist Studies
of
The International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies
1996

Klong-chen rab- 'byams-pa Dri-med 'od-zer

The Full-Fledged *Khyung-chen* Bird

An Essay in Freedom as the Dynamics of Being

Edited, translated, and annotated by

Herbert Guenther

Tokyo
The International Institute for Buddhist Studies
of
The International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies
1996

Published by The International Institute for Buddhist Studies of *ICABS*
5-3-23 Toranomon, Minato-ku, Tokyo 105, Japan

First published 1996
Printed in Japan by Bethel-Photo Printing Company, Tokyo

ISBN 4-906267-38-5

Correspondence regarding all editorial matters should be sent to the Director of The International Institute for Buddhist Studies in Tokyo.

Dedicated to

Toyo and Leslie

For Reasons

Best

Known To Them

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa's *The Full-fledged khyung-chen Bird* is an unusual composition — unusual in the sense that its very title is both an allusion and a symbol. It alludes to Śrīsiṃha, an early figure in the history of Tibetan-Buddhist thought when it still based itself on an individual's lived experience (*Erleben* in Dilthey's diction) prior to its shaping by any theorizing about it. Very little is known about Śrīsiṃha except for the statement by Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa that he was the "abbot from China" (*rgya-nag-gi mkhan-po*),[1] the much maligned opponent of the Indian Kamalaśīla, a logician and theoretician, at the so-called bSam-yas "debate" which we now know to have been a historico-political hoax with devastating consequences for what once was a richly orchestrated quest for life's meaning. For Śrīsiṃha the *khyung-chen* bird, hovering in the sky, was a favorite, if not to say, the most favorite image for an individual's spirituality[2] pervasive of the whole of human existence without being

---

[1] *gNas-lugs*, p. 68.

[2] It would have been more "natural" and, by implication, reductionist, to speak of an individual's consciousness. Unfortunately, our "consciousness" is too ego-logical as to provide an inkling of what is intended by Buddhist thinkers. The words of David Michael Levin, *The Opening of Vision* , p. 201, deserve to be kept in mind:

> Western psychology, uncritically reflecting the narrowed vision of ontically forgetful everydayness, continues to obscure our experience of this 'immemorial depth of vision'. Even Carl Jung, who struggled — against Freud — to conceptualize a theory of 'depth psychology', found it virtually impossible to see clearly beyond the realm of ego's constitution, where subject and object appear together in a structure of extreme polarization.

localizable in any manner in any one of its levels:

> Moving like the *khyung-chen* hovering in the sky,[3]

and

> Like the *khyung-chen* that neither rests in the sky nor on the earth,[4]

and

> Like the *khyung-chen* hovering in the sky and leaving no trace (and)
> Like the *khyung-chen*, with its wings spread, not remaining (stationary) in the sky,[5]

and, last but not least,

> (With an individual's spirituality it is like with) the *khyung-chen* whose body is fully grown and whose wings are fully developed (when it emerges from the egg),
> It has not to be looked for elsewhere, but is complete since time before time.[6]

What we, here, have termed "spirituality" is, in the case of Śrīsiṃha, a continuation and deepening of the mentalistic trend (*cittamâtra* , Tib. *sems-tsam*)

---

[3] *Byang-chub-kyi sems khyung-chen-gyi rgyud* , 6: 70a.

[4] *Ibid* ., fol. 81b.

[5] *Ibid* ., fol. 84b.

[6] *Ibid* ., fol. 82a. It seems that the title of Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa's essay — *khyung-chen gshog-rdzogs* — is a condensation of the first line in this stanza: *khyung-chen lus-rgyas 'dab-gshog rdzogs* .

in Indian-Buddhist philosophical thought that, unlike its contemporary and subsequent preoccupation with logic, was of paramount existential significance: — from the perspective of ontology, "spirituality" was called "thinking's thinking" (*sems-nyid*); from the perspective of psychology, it was called "mind" (*sems*); and from the perspective of the prevailing *Zeitgeist*, it was called "the mind's thrust in the direction of refinement and wholeness" (*byang-chub-kyi sems*). All of these terms were attempts to fathom the mystery that is the living human individual.[7] Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa's use of this image of the *khyung-chen* by which he alludes to Śrīsiṃha is thus a tribute to a person whom he highly esteemed.

---

7 For *sems-nyid* there is no Sanskrit equivalent; *sems*, of course, is Sanskrit *citta*, always in the indigenous texts understood as a feedback-feedforward mechanism and thus emphasizing the human "system's" operational capability (technically referred to as *thabs*, Skt. *upāya*); and *byang-chub-(kyi)-sems* is itself a hermeneutical interpretation of Sanskrit *bodhicitta*. In his *Byang-chub-kyi sems khyung-chen-gyi rgyud*, 6: 70a, Śrīsiṃha declares:

sems ni gzhi ste chos-rnams sna-tshogs lam
mchog-tu stong-pa de-bzhin chos-la gnas

sems is [life's] foundation; the multiplicity of thoughts/meanings is the way;
(As) the zero-point energy of the vacuum it is in the thoughts/meanings.

and on fol. 84a of the same work he says:

gzhi-rtsa med-pa'i byang-chub-sems-nyid ni
chos-rnams ma-lus kun-gyi rtsa-ba yin

This very (*nyid*) thrust towards refinement and wholeness (*byang-chub-sems*)
that has neither a foundation (to rest on) nor root (from which to grow)
Is the root of all and sundry thoughts and meanings.

In view of the fact that "basic" works are written or handed down in verse form, metrical exigencies determine the form in which a word appears. This "form" may not always correspond to the "intended meaning." An obvious example is *sems/sems-nyid* in the above quotations.

Unlike signs, symbols play an important role in an individual's search for meaning in his understanding of himself.[8] Born out of the psyche's dynamics, symbols cannot be reduced to anything else but the psyche's very dynamics that expresses itself through the symbol in the form of images that not only are intellectually *and* emotionally challenging, but also make the invisible visible. Literally rendered, the term *khyung-chen* can be said to denote a giant eagle or vulture as one may see it in the lonely stretches of the Himalayan mountains. Such a rendering merely reflects the literalist's and reductionist's fallacy of attempting to comprehend everything from the specific point of view that his narrowly circumscribed consciousness permits. In the indigenous texts the term *khyung* is never used in the context of zoology and placed on the same level as other birds. Moreover, if not specified as *chen* — used as an elative: "nothing could be greater than" — this bird is said to be "golden":[9]

---

[8] I understand "he" and "his" and "himself" always to mean "he and/or she," "his and/or her," and "himself and/or herself."

[9] *Seng-ge rtsal-rdzogs* , p. 302:

rang-snang gser-gyi nam-mkha'-la
gser-gyi 'dab-chags bya khyung lding
rtog-med yid-kyis khyung-chen gzung

The whole fifth chapter of this work is devoted to contrasting the immense openness of the sky (*nam-mkha'*) with the immense depth of a lake (*mtsho-mo*), both immensities being symbols of our beingness that in its spirituality is symbolized by the golden *khyung*, and in its existentiality by a golden fish. This contrast between bird and fish calls to mind the opening lines of the first chapter in Chuang Tsu's *Inner Chapters* with their reference to the fish called Kun and the bird called Peng. The image of the golden fish, symbol of the "real" lying concealed in the ocean of the "unreal/irreal", forms the theme of the fourth chapter of the *Byang-chub-sems-kyi man-ngag rin-chen phreng-ba*, 6: 146ab.

In the golden sky, alight by itself,

There hovers a golden bird, the *khyung* [10] —

Catch this *khyung-chen* that is your mind undivided by concepts.

This passage, one among many similar ones, makes it abundantly clear that the *khyung* or *khyung-chen* is a symbol for the human spirit as it soars and hovers in the immensity of the sky, an immensity that is both "out there" and "in here" in each of us.

Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa's composition is unusual in still another sense. It stands alone among the many other works he liked to group into trilogies. In his own words this composition is less a summary of what he has said, than a reference text for anyone desirous of understanding the basic meaning of life that shines forth in a moment of Ek-stasis. This "standing-outside-self" has nothing to do with so-called ecstatic states of mind and the like. The indigenous texts describe this experience to be such as "everything impeding having been chopped

---

[10] I have left this term untranslated for various reasons. Each culture has its own stock of symbols that cannot be replaced by another culture's stock of symbols without destroying their original force. The Chinese spoke of the *Peng* (see previous note); the Indians spoke of the *garuḍa*, the mount of the god Viṣṇu; the Persians spoke of the *Simurgh*, but had other winged symbols that they had taken over from Babylon and Egypt; and the Romans had the *eagle* whose nature Desiderius Erasmus (*c.* 1466-1536) succinctly summed up in these words:

> The eagle is the image of the king, neither beautiful, nor musical, nor fit for food: but carnivorous, rapacious, a brigand, a destroyer, solitary, hated by all, a pest...

What a difference between the *khyung* as a symbol of the human spirit and the eagle as a symbol of human brutality!

Concerning the use of *khyung/khyung-chen,* see also the remarks concerning *sems/sems-nyid* in note 7.

away" (*khregs-chod*) — a descriptive term that seems to have been coined by Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa himself and picked up by all writers after his time.

As a reference work Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa's composition is only indirectly didactic. It does not lead the listener or reader step by step to a preconceived and already preëstablished goal. Rather, it speaks from the experience of one who is already there. The manner in which this experience is expressed in words, is highly poetic. Poetic diction is uniquely suited and able to show, make manifest, reveal something as it comes-to and is felt-as a presence in the experiencer's vision that has not yet been dazzled, made squint-eyed and blind by theories of cognition that the moment they are formulated already are shot through and through with fallacies. Poetic diction reveals by saying repeatedly and by making use of "ornaments of speech" (*tshig-gi rgyan*) of which the *zung-ldan-gyi rgyan* is the one most favored by Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa. This ornament is characterized by a peculiar repetition of one or more syllables or words that are placed either mediately or immediately or both ways in a single line or a whole stanza. Whenever and wherever it occurs it has the effect of alerting the listener or reader. This alerting is subtly intensified by the metrical form in which Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa's composition is written. Each line consists of nine syllables that group themselves in the following syllabic pattern:

(2+2) (2) (3)

in which (2+2) forms one set that, imposing on it our rigid (Aristotelian)

categories of grammar, may be said to be the subject of the sentence, while the set of three syllables (3) forms the predicate. The set of two syllables (2) between "subject" and "predicate" is ambivalent, it allows itself to be linked up with the subject or predicate or both. The implication of this fluidity that must be fully grasped before any understanding of what an author wants to say is possible, is that a Tibetan sentence is constructed by placing the largely denotative linguistic symbols (syllables, words) in the order in which the items denoted in immediate experience are associated and in which such copular devices as "is" and "has" are simply nonexistent. Each line and each stanza, consisting of a number of lines, is a kind of impressionist miniature painting — spontaneous and unpremeditated.

A mere glance at Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa's poetic composition immediately arrests one's attention by the repeated use of three foundational words — *grol*, *rang*, and *ye*. With the possible exemption of *rang*, any attempt at a "literal" translation, by which a mechanical transposing of one word of a foreign language into one's mother tongue is understood, is bound to fail for many reasons. I am, of course, fully aware of the controversy between translation and interpretation, which has raged and still rages in academic circles and has spilled over into the cultist-fundamentalist circles who hope thereby to gain respectability. Translating is said to be "objective" and interpreting is dismissed as "subjective", as fanciful and useless as is poetry for the hard-boiled (unimaginative) realist. The fallacy of this "reasoning" is the nonrecognition of

the fact that any translation is already an interpretation, because it has been made by a person who — oh, horror! — quite "subjectively" chose the text he intended to translate and, unbeknownst to him, brought to it the fore-structure of his thinking. This fore-structure determined, well in advance, how he was going to deal with the chosen text — reductionistically, if he was (or maybe still is) a technico-philologically minded person, and hermeneutically, if he should be a thinker (which is not the same as being a "subjectivist").

The three foundational words *grol*, *rang*, and *ye* bear on an individual's *Existenz* , not in the Kantian or Scholastic sense of being some natural thing, but in the Heideggerian sense of being that unique being "which we ourselves are, the *human Dasein*, "[11] towards which we are orientated and in which we find our *raison d' être* .[12] Experientially speaking, this our *Existenz* or deeply felt *Dasein* that in its specific mode of being is already and always in and with a world, is, in Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa's words, "thinking's thinking" (*sems-nyid*) — a sheer intensity subtly intimating the experiencer's selfhood symbolized by the "king," — and the world in and with which it exists, is the "giving birth to thoughts and/or meanings" (*chos-nyid*) — a dynamic expanse, imaged as a fertile "field" or richly populated "realm." Both thinking's thinking and the giving birth to

[11] Martin Heidegger, *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology* , p. 28.

[12] This "Daseinsorientation" is the subject matter of Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa's *gNas-lugs rin-po-che'i mdzod.*

thoughts/meanings belong together and even have to be thought together. This togetherness is their transcendence, the over-and-out-and-beyond, that makes a world and being-in-a-world possible. The dynamics of this transcendence as an "out-from-itSelf" and a "towards-itSelf" is summed up in the term *grol-(ba)* for which, strictly speaking, we have no adequate term. As a matter of fact, our terms "freedom" and "free" are most static concepts and, consequently, miss the process character of the Tibetan term that is descriptive of a vector feeling-tone that is inseparable from the process in which everything restrictive of its sheer intensity is, quite literally, felt to dissolve into a shimmering presence of openness.

The term *rang*, frequently forming a compound with *grol*, is always used reflexively and emphasizes the individual's experienceable and experienced selfhood as his or her "own most unique ability-to-be" (*rang-bzhin*). Apart from being a process whose vector-feeling-tone has been described as (*grol*), this, the experiencer's own most unique ability-to-be, is also what is called "thinking's thinking" (*sems-nyid*) reverberating in one's "natural mind" (*gnyug-ma'i sems*), forming, as it were, the link between our transcendence that "has no ground to rest on and no roots to grow from" and our enworldedness. In the words of Martin Heidegger:[13]

The original nature of transcendence makes itself manifest in the

[13] *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology* , p. 300.

basic constitution of being-in-the-world .

Here a word of caution is necessary concerning the use of the phrase "one's (the experiencer's) own most unique ability-to-be." It is not so that the experiencer is one thing and the ability-to-be another thing, held together by the relation of ownership. The experiencer *is* his ability-to-be, *is* his transcendence, there is nothing else.

The third term *ye* points to a temporality that was already active before time emerged as time's linearity and, if this is the correct term, "initiated" the individual's awareness of his Dasein. This originary awareness in all its modes, the experiencer's *anfängliche Denken* of which Martin Heidegger has spoken repeatedly, is termed *ye-shes*. In itself it is a function of the supraconscious ecstatic intensity (*rig-pa*) of his whole being. This ecstatic intensity is nobody else's intensity but the whole's (and by implication, the individual's) own (*rang*) intensity, and its dynamics makes itself felt "of its own" which is to say "by itself" (*rang-rig*). After all, each of us is the whole and only a part of it. This, the whole's and our "own most unique ability-to-be" (*rang-bzhin*) is in its intensity or, more precisely, in its self-intensification (*rang-rig*) truly ecstatic, ek-static, standing outside self. Its *ek-stasis* is "felt" as the perpetual casting off and dissolution of what curtails its intensity, taking place by itself (*rang-grol*) and having done so since "time before time" (*ye-grol*).

Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa's *The Full-fledged Khyung-chen Bird*, is a

work of art whose intrinsic beauty and depth of meaning reveals itself to anyone who takes the time to feel himself into it.

The Full-fledged *Khyung-chen* Bird

1 Homage to Being's ubiquitous giving birth to thoughts/meanings.

2 Homage to the dimension that is thinking's thinking in which (what eventually constitutes my phenomenal and noumenal) reality is already fully pre-existent, whilst yet
Lying beyond the dichotomies of rejection and acceptance, negation and affirmation, expectations and apprehensions —
(This dimension points back to) one's natural mind that [like Being's wholeness] has no ground and no roots, that is not subject to transformations, that in (being)
Uncontrived is the king, and in which all that has been ordered (as one's phenomenal world) is "felt"to dissolve by itself.

3 Listen to (my account of how I have understood this my) own most unique ability-to-be into which the whole of my phenomenal and noumenal reality has since time before time dissolved (over and again) —
This dimension of my existential reality that lies beyond everything without having had to give up anything,
Thinking's thinking, the king, the ultimate completeness of its own most unique ability-to-be,
The (spiralling) vortex (of energy) that from the beginning has been of exquisite purity and that is lying beyond the reach of representational thought.

4 Thinking's thinking that is inexpressible by words of mouth,complete since time before time, and (vast like) the sky's immensity

With nothing before it to enact and yet (always) acting without toil,
lies beyond all the limits set up by organismic thinking,
Unobsessed with whatever has come-to-presence (before it), in its spontaneity roaming far and wide, this (spiralling) vortex of the supraconscious ecstatic intensity
Is such that all that has been ordered (as one's phenomenal world) is "felt" to dissolve by itself, (so that) with one's gaze (lost in) the clearance of the visual field, there is nothing (that might be said) to be an object of representational thought.
Do not attempt to "fix" or vitiate what is settled in its own most unique ability-to-be.

5 A deluded person who has thrown away the very substance (of his being)
Degrades his natural mind into a physician's pannier.
Tinkering and tinkering with (his mind/pannier), he obscures (the whole's) energy (working in and through his) existentiality.
For him there is no freedom; rather he fetters himself anew by this tinkering.

6 Where and when (the stress of a person's) intellect has been resolved in what is its heart-felt immensity
There and then (the person has become) his own most unique ability-to-be. There is (then) no point in tinkering with it (in the mistaken assumption that it could be improved).
This knowledge that what has become visible through an intrapsychic stirring is (the whole's) own purificatory dynamics should not be vitiated by interfering with it (in an attempt to "fix" it so much more so as it) is not going to be changed by what (the intellect believes) has

to be (removed and) rejected, is (what is meant by) utter "completeness."

7 Will a person longing for his feeling-free, but tinkering and tinkering
With the openness of wholeness, (similar to) the vast sky, in which all concrete things (of one's reality) dissolve,
Ever find release from the postulates of eternity and nihility
When he but brushes aside that which is, into some nothing and then posits this nothing as something that is?

8 That which has been utterly complete since time before time (and is such that for it) there is no (other) ground (than its own completeness) and (hence also) is without roots,
Is not something to be intellectually-rationalistically imagined as some nothingness or some presence, something existent or something nonexistent.
Where there is such fancying there is some (preconceived) envisioning and an engagement in the horizon set by it,
There is some interpretation of what has come-to-presence (and as a result) there is the frustration of samsara.
Where there is an ideology there is an ardent pursuit of it;
There is the cage of the emotions and there is their fettering us.

9 For him in whom there is no longer the slightest preoccupation with (any) spiritual pursuit's claims, since
He has done with the obsession of attaining a goal that is without (any) ground (to start with) and (at which) the way (to it) stops,
There is no karmic blundering and there is no shrouding (of his being) by

the consequences into which this blundering matures;
Rather, he finds (and lives) his being-and-feeling-free in the dimension of (Being's) wholeness (that is as vast as) the sky, by neither continuing in a state of enworldedness nor continuing in a state of quiescence.

10 There are those who declare that the cause for their (existential feeling of) being-free is summed up in the statement about there being (some) pleasure (being bodily felt) and (some) nothingness (mentally postulated and judged as such) involving
The refinement and efficient working of the lines of force (that constitute their corporeal schema) and of the currents (moving along these lines) as well as the control over (the direction into which the) psychic energy (is to move) and
The degrees of intensities (experienced) in the joy, heightened joy, ante-climax joy, and the joy in the spontaneity (of the orgasm)
As these develop in the pleasure of the two sex organs joining.
Will these people ever be able to go anywhere beyond the realm of desires?
Through a bogus nothingness a genuine feeling-of-being-free does not come about.

11 Those who fancy their (subjective) mind to be the *lumen naturale* or tinker with the luminescence of the colors of the organism's vibrations
As they light up before the senses (prior to their becoming misconstructed as) objective "realities" and
Declare this to be (what is meant by) undividedness-by-concepts,
Are entrenched in their belief in the existence of (some) apprehendable (thing) and some apprehending (agency).
Having been fettered by the chain (of this dichotomy)

Will there be for them any feeling-of-being-free from the realm of aesthetic forms?

12 Even if people fancy a mental state that is non-referential and without any imagery,
Once their body has been forced into a rigid posture, speech has been restrained, mind has (been brought under control and) become concentrated, and its dichotomic thinking has been repressed,
They will continue wandering about in the four infinity feelings that make up the realm of no-forms, and
Never will there be for them any feeling-of-being-free.

13 Apart from wandering about in the possible realms of desires, aesthetic forms, and no-forms in which
Each (so-patterned) mind presents its probabilistic level of pleasure, luminescence, and dichotomy suspension, (respectively),
There is for these people no chance of having a feeling-of-being-free.
This state of affairs applies to the addicts of extremes as well.
So, what is the difference of such people from other people?

14 Moreover, even if it is claimed that the purpose is to fancy all this as a nothing,
By tinkering and tinkering (with wholeness) and fancying it as a nothing,
That which might (by ordinary standards) be a positive and healthy idea (turns out to be that person's) intellectual involvement with an overevaluation that fetters him (to it);
What benefit derives from a nothing that is not settled in (that person's) own most unique ability-to-be?

The sequence of thoughts forming a motley of positive and negative ideas
Again and again lays the foundation for the city of samsara;
Thinking positively leads to the two happy forms of life, heaven and the human world,
Thinking negatively leads to the three unhappy forms of life;
Traversing them one after the other, one is unable to cross the river of samsara.

15 Where good and evil as the causal momentum for one's blunders no longer exists,
There is no wandering about in samsara as the effect set up by this momentum.
(This open dimension) is like the sky; what can shroud it?

16 Apart from drifting about and wearing himself out on the ocean of worldliness,
A person looking for a sense-specific harbor (that promises the) end of his toils,
Will not be able to reach the opposite shore of the ocean, emancipation.
As long as there is a mind imaginatively working with sense-specific objects,
(Anything sense-specific) will be attained through concerted efforts, but so long also
There is no means to have the feeling-of-being-free from what is the very constitution of samsara.

17 The soaring of the supraconscious ecstatic intensity's creative dynamics into the (immensity of the) sky as its cognitive domain

Marks the moment when the king with nothing sense-specific before him and without apprehending (anything) in the manner of an egological subject has made his appearance (as a felt presence).
Having by himself (retrieved the integrity of) his feeling-free from his enworldedness that is the duality of a subject over and against an object
He (now) abides in the dimension that throughout the three aspects of time never steps out of itself nor changes into something other than itself.

18 On him whose heart has been infected by the poison of drudgery
The world's frustrating suffering falls like rain.
When there is no drudgery (one is) the king (and) without the urge to do something one's mind feels perfectly happy;
When there is the feeling-of-being-free (operative all) by itself (one is) the king, and having won the assurance of (one's) being identical with the whole,
The moving to and fro of (one's) thoughts arises as the frolicking of (the whole's) originary awareness:
(This means that) one has arrived at the primordial level (of one's being) where no errancy obtains —
One has found one's life's meaning, self-evolved and spontaneously present.

19 He who in his (egocentric) mind would like (to know) who this feeling-of-being-free is
Should not (egocentrically) attempt to either "fix" or vitiate his natural mind.

20 By tinkering and tinkering (with one's freedom) one certainly fetters

(oneself), (therefore)

Do not look for things to do when your mind rejoices in having settled by itself in the dimension

Where the core of (one's) supraconscious ecstatic intensity, uncontrived (as) the king, spontaneous and complete, has settled. In this (time- and space-binding) moment (when everything has been) irrealized,

There is not so much as an atom in it (to allow you) to negate or to affirm what it is (by saying:) "this is it."

Neither has it anything to do with notions of rejection and acceptance (by stating that) this "this is it" (must or must not exist.

In this dimension in which (the postulates of) a starting-point (for the individuation process), a way (along which it travels), and a goal (at which it arrives) have all dissolved,

The king as the freedom that he is by himself, does not step out of it (himself) nor changes into something other than it (himself) throughout the three aspects of time.

Inexpressible by words of mouth, beyond representational thought — (such is one's) *Da*-sein with (what eventually constitutes one's phenomenal and noumenal) reality already fully pre-existent, the (spiralling) vortex of (one's) natural mind.

There is no (*thing*ish) feeling-of-being-free since there exists not so much as an atom to constitute a ground or reason for (there being) some (*thing*ish) feeling-of-being-free;

There does not exist anything to be looked at, there does not exist anything to be seen, there does not exist anything to be pointed out by metaphors;

(What there is) lies beyond the domain of representational thought and,

hence, is not a thing that can be thought about.

21 (Life's meaning) in transcending the four (limiting) alternatives (of rational thought) —

Neither (something) existent nor nonexistent, neither (something) being both (existent and nonexistent) together nor being neither (existent and nonexistent) together —

Is (termed) the ubiquity (spiralling) vortex;

In its own most unique ability-to-be, its spontaneity and completeness, its non-birth — (life's meaning) is (termed) the sky (spiralling) vortex;

With its depth and width to which no limiting alternatives (of rational thought) apply, its preciousness — (life's meaning) is (termed) the ocean (spiralling) vortex;

In its own most unique ability-to-be, (as) the *lumen naturale*, the paradox of there being a luminous presence that yet is nothing — (life's meaning) is (termed) the sun-and-moon (spiralling) vortex;

In (being) uncontrived (and) the king, (life's meaning) is (termed) the inseparability (spiralling) vortex.

22 Its auto-presencing in the absence of (any) causal momentum and without the latter's (accompanying) modifiers (retains) the purity (it has in what is) its legitimate dwelling (and thus presents)

The core intensity of the supraconscious ecstatic intensity in which all that has been ordered (as one's phenomenal world) dissolves by itself with no obscuration (being left behind).

Through a tremor-like intrapsychic stirring, (this core intensity) ceases (to be what it is), but through (its) lighting-up it dissolves in what is its

legitimate dwelling.

"Freedom" and "unfreedom" are words used in common parlance, (in what they purport to be) they are like a dream;

What kind of "freedom"-thing can there be in the (whole's) dimension that is without any roots?

All such claims (about freedom being some thing that can be reduced to some other thing) are mere words used in common parlance.

23 The (experience of this) supraconscious ecstatic intensity as the king (of one's psychic-spiritual life) is, in its nothingness-radiance, the assurance about (one's) humanity;

The (experience of this intensity as its) being-free since time before time and settled in itself, is the assurance about its time-before-time validity in an ultimate sense;

The (experience of this intensity as such) that, without anything having had to be given up, is, in its entirety and completeness, the assurance about its primordial purity;

The (experience of this intensity as) invariance-spontaneity is the assurance about its being without any ground and without any roots;

The (experience of this intensity as the) auto-dissolution of all that has been ordered (as one's phenomenal world), is the assurance about (its) coming-to-presence in an ultimate sense.

24 Fresh, natural, uncontrived, normal,

This plain cognitive principle, (always) dissolving by itself (into the freedom that it is), is the road of the (spiritually) victorious ones;

(This principle's) auto-excitation (into its supraconscious ecstatic intensity) and auto-dissolution (into the freedom that it is) need not be "fixed"

by (extraneous) aids.

In the (spiralling) vortex of this supraconscious ecstatic intensity, (that is) unborn, spontaneous and complete,

Whatever lights up is such as to come as one's friend; here

The source of (one's) going astray into (the fictions of) rejection and acceptance has dried up.

Whatever has lit up as good and evil, happiness and sorrow, is the dimension of this supraconscious ecstatic intensity.

(What is this intensity's) own most unique ability-to-be-this-ecstatic-intensity is (also) the dimension for the play of its originary awareness modes.

The fact that (henceforward) there is no longer any reason for straying into either samsara or nirvana is the greatest miracle.

25 While (wholeness in its) oneness can account for the being-free of the plurality (of its concrete reality), the plurality (of its concrete reality in its being-free) cannot account for the being-free of (wholeness in its) oneness:

Once you know this to be the case, (you experience for yourself the whole's) auto-dissolution (into the freedom that it is) as the quintessence of the supraconscious ecstatic intensity. (It involves)

The time-before-time being-free. (This means that there) exists no reason to reduplicate (what already is) and (this is what is meant by) "the dimension of (the whole's) beginning;

The being-free in its perceptible imperceptibility. (This means that there) exists no materiality (as some entity) and (this is what is meant by) "the voidance of anything claimed to be real or true;"

The auto-dissolution (of the phenomenal into the freedom that it is.) (This

means that there) exists no (extraneous) aid (to effect this freedom) and (this is what is meant by) "one's natural mind;"

The intrapsychic stirring and (its) dissolution (into the freedom from which this stirring has originated). (This means that it is of) symbolic pregnance in its legitimate dwelling. This "time- and space-binding" (means that)

The coming-to-the-fore (of structures) and their dissolution occurs simultaneously, which means that there exists neither a before nor an after.

26 Do not make an issue of anything anywhere; let that which is non-referential

Roam as it pleases in its self-structuration and self-settling.

Its self-surfacing and self-plummeting defies all attempts to grasp it concretely.

Do not fashion (this openness into some sort of thing) with your intellect; do not suppress the tremor-like glinting (in this openness).

There do not exist external or internal domains (to arrest the dynamics of this openness whose) dimension is as vast as the sky.

In this dimension that has been a dynamic nothingness since time-before-time, your intellect is brought to nothing and an immense openness prevails;

In this dimension that has done with the phenomena, your intellect has done with (its ruminations), — oh, what jubilant joy (you experience)!

27 What an object is in itself lies beyond the corruption by the intellect,

For what is the intellect's "stuff" there does not exist (anything in the manner of an) object that might shroud it.

Do not act (out on this openness/nothingness your corrupting notions of) rejection or acceptance, negation or affirmation, expectation or apprehension.

28 (The whole's) giving birth to thoughts/meanings, unlocalizable, beyond any verbalizability,
Uncontrived, placid, free since time before time
Is not in need of being "fixed" by aids (in order to ensure the rejection of its) external and internal (overlays).

29 Wherever, in his own most unique being-free, the king settles, there is the core intensity of (the whole's) supraconscious ecstatic intensity.
Self-established, unconcerned (with the duality of approval and disapproval) [this intensity occupies] the dimension that can neither be improved nor vitiated.
Spontaneous and spreading, this supraconscious ecstatic intensity plays with whatever has arisen (before its gaze) as its cognitive domain.

30 This dimension of graciousness for which one does not have to search, since it is (already) self-established and self-settled,
Marks the end of words and intellection; it transcends the scope of one's sensory capacities.
There is nothing (in it) that can be looked at, there is nothing (in it) that can be imaginatively developed, there is nothing (in it) to which one might point and say "this is it".
Without (feeling the urge to) do something, whilst holding (in oneself) the strength of a simpleton, is (what is meant by) feeling ego-logically happy.

31 This one's incomparable existential reality in which (the whole's) ubiquitous originary awareness, knowing of no parochialism in the absence of any bias,
Shines unsullied in its own effulgence,
Is not found by searching for it, but is found by a letting-be:
The (whole's) lighting-up by itself (in the wake of an) intrapsychic stirring structures itself into the play (staged by the guiding image) of one's humanity.
From the moment onward of its so having structured itself it remains unaffected by the mire of (the sun's and moon's) rising and setting (in the sky).
May through the kindness of the teacher-supreme this understanding concretely govern (one's life).

32 This plenitude of a supraconscious ecstatic intensity, being its own most unique ability-to-be-its-freedom, self-settled, (but)
Not understood by following the ways of the sundry philosophical systems, and
Without the imputations the intellect with its thinking in terms of (ready-made) ideas (attempts to) impose on it, is the miracle (of one's being).

33 In the soaring of one's contextualized mind into the sky-like spaciousness of its background
Whose dimension is such that in it (what eventually constitutes our phenomenal and noumenal) reality is already fully preexistent and goes beyond everything one's ego-logical mind can think of,
There marches the whole's unique information dynamics, independent of

any causal momentum and its accompanying modifiers.

34 Lighting up by itself in the clear sky that is (the whole's) own most unique
ability-to-be and
Nailed down by the big nail of its invariance and self-consistency,
This dimension that overarches the four alternatives (of rational thought)
that are neither some thing alight nor some nothing.
Is the ever widening (spiralling) vortex of the visible as a structured
nothingness that (potentially) contains everything —
(Through) its own most unique ability-to-be dissolving by itself (into the
freedom that it is), its spontaneous presence is an ever widening
(spiralling) vortex.

35 The meaning of spanning the four alternatives (symbolically intimated by
the title) "The Full-fledged *Khyung-chen* Bird"
Has been discussed by Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa in harmony with (this
spiralling vortex of dynamic wholeness after which he has named
himself). May through this discourse
All living beings find their wholeness in (this spiralling) vortex from which
nothing has been excluded.

The Full-fledged *Khyung-chen* Bird

Annotated translation

[A brief presentation of the individual's Dasein[1] by way of a shorter and a longer invocation formula]

1 Homage to Being's ubiquitous giving birth to thoughts/meanings (*chos-nyid gdal-ba-chen-po*).[2]

---

[1] *gnas-lugs* . This term may be translated literally both as "abidingness" and as "Dasein (*Da* -sein)". In the former case the connotation of this process word is similar to Henri Bergson's idea of "duration" (*durée*) of which he in his *Matter and Memory*, p. 186, says: "... a continuity which is really lived ..." and "The duration *wherein we see ourselves acting*, and in which it is useful that we should see ourselves, is a duration whose elements are dissociated and juxtaposed. The duration *wherein we act* is a duration wherein our states melt into each other." In the latter case the connotation of this term is similar to Martin Heidegger's idea of *Dasein* of which he in his *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, p. 120, says: "... the being that we ourselves are, the Dasein, cannot at all be *interrogated* as such by the question What *is this?* We gain access to this being only if we ask: *Who* is it? The Dasein is not constituted by whatness but — if we may coin the expression — by *whoness*. The answer does not give a thing, but an I, you, we." Furthermore, in the sense of "abidingness," *gnas-lugs* occurs in the compound *dngos-po gshis-kyi gnas-lugs*, a coded term, frequently met with in Padmasambhava's writings, that may be decoded as "the pervasive abidingness/presence of Being's (the whole's) dynamic nothingness/energy-field in the concrete." Its pervasiveness is likened to the presence of oil in a sesame seed. In the sense of Dasein/Da-sein, *gnas-lugs* corresponds to Heidegger's idea of *Ereignis* . This term seems to have been borrowed by him from Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's *Faust*, part II, line 12106. It is my contention that all traditional translations of this term by "event" or "appropriation" or "appropriative event" are wrong. The German noun *Ereignis/Er-eignis* is related to its adjectival form *eigen* "own" (as in Eigenzustand, English eigenstate and in Eigenfunktion, English eigenfunction), that is, "nobody else's" state or function. This is precisely the meaning of the term *rang* in the compound *rang-bzhin*, frequently used by all sNying-thig (rDzogs-chen) thinkers, the difference between *gnas-lugs* and *rang-bzhin* being that the former is more "general", the latter more "individual". Following Heidegger's penetrating analysis of Dasein in his *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, p. 276, the Tibetan *rang-bzhin* is best, though ponderously, rendered as "the whole's (Being's) coming-into and continuing in its own most unique ability-to-be" — *rang* "(one's) own (most unique)" and *bzhin* "continuing in (one's) own (most unique)."

[2] Unlike in epistemology-oriented works, in rDzogs-chen experience-oriented works, *chos-nyid* is a dynamic concept that functions as a correlate to the equally dynamic concept of *sems-nyid*, introduced in the longer invocation formula. The dynamics summed up in the term *chos-nyid* is best circumscribed as a probabilistic distribution of meanings (*chos*) as well as their dissolution (*nyid*) in an ongoing process. It is a salient feature of process thinking that it does not admit of any sharp separation between opposite aspects of reality and also transcends any dialectic synthesis of opposites. This feature is indicated by the term *gdal-ba-chen-po* (synonymous with the more frequently used *khyab-brdal*) that I have tentatively rendered by "ubiquitous" and that has been explained by Vairocana (*rGyud-'bum*, vol. 7, p. 217) as meaning the unity of the "encompassed (*khyab-bya*) and the encompassing (*khyab-byed*)". By this explication the

2 Homage to the dimension that is thinking's thinking (*sems-nyid*)[3] in which (what eventually constitutes our phenomenal and noumenal) reality is already fully pre-existent[4], whilst yet

Lying beyond the dichotomies of rejection and acceptance, negation and affirmation, expectations and apprehensions —

(This dimension points back to) one's natural mind (*gnyug-ma'i sems*)[5] that

---

ubiquitous presence of the correlate to *chos-nyid* , that is, *sems-nyid* is intimated. While in the term *chos-nyid* the emphasis is on "meaning(s)" (*chos*), which makes it a pre- eminently cognitive term, in the term *sems-nyid* the emphasis is on "thinking's (*sems*) thinking (*nyid*), "which makes it a pre-eminently actional term. Hence, *sems-nyid* is related to *thabs* "effectiveness" and *chos-nyid* is related to *shes-rab* "appreciation-discrimination." Thinking's thinking" (*sems-nyid*) and the "thoughts or meanings" (*chos-nyid*) constitute an indivisible whole, a kind of two-as-one. Its indivisibility is, dynamically speaking, a sheer intensity that sets up "dimensions" (*ngang*) of intensities reflecting the degree of the intensities passing through them. Common to both is their qualification as "immense": *chos-nyid* is described as being of an immense depth and (spatial) vastness (*gting-mtha' yangs-pa*) and *sems-nyid* is described as an immense depth without conceptual limits (*mu-med gting-yangs*) in *Nyi-zla'i snying-po*, fol. 21b and *bDud-rtsi bcud-thigs*, fol. 326a, respectively. From all that has been said it follows that *chos-nyid* and *sems-nyid* are not static entities, but dynamic functions of the energy that we ourselves are, intimated by the term *gnyug-ma'i sems* "(one's) natural mind, "where *gnyug-ma* is synonymous with *snying-po* "energy" (both cosmic and psychic). See *sNang-srid kha-sbyor*, fol. 257a: *snying-po 'gyur-med gnyug-ma yin*. "Cosmic," this energy is the whole (wholeness) and "psychic," it is the authentic Self whose symbol is the king (see below n. 8). From the Western point of view we witness here the extension of a binary subject/object relationship to a ternary relationship that allows us to speak of the *autocatalysis of wholeness* into its actional aspect, thinking's thinking (*sems-nyid*) and its appreciatively felt dimension of thoughts/meanings (*chos-nyid*).

[3] See note 2. The relationship between *sems-nyid* and *chos-nyid* is one of inseparability and indivisibility; by contrast the relationship between *chos* "the 'things' we think of" and *sems* "our egological mind" is one of division and fragmentation.

[4] *gzhi-rdzogs* . In this technical term *gzhi* is used to intimate the primacy of the whole's self-existent originary awareness (*rang-byung ye-shes*) as a function of its "stuff" that is its supraconscious ecstatic intensity (*rig-pa, rig-pa'i ngo-bo*). From the perspective of wholeness (*rdzogs*), the universe as we are going to experience and describe it, is already pre-existent in the sense that what we then say to be the whole of samsara is a dream-like coming-to-existence (*snang-ba*) that by the very dynamics of the ecstatic intensity is concretized into the model that constitutes our egologically constructed world in which the luminosity of the ecstatic intensity is at best a dim memory. What we then say to be the whole of nirvana is not some entity among other entities, but the whole itself of which we can speak only in metaphorical terms: the spontaneity of the sun's presence and the spontaneity with which its rays spread.

[5] See note 2.

[like Being's wholeness] has no ground and no roots[6], that is not subject to transformations[7], that in (being)

Uncontrived is the king,[8] and in which all that has been ordered (as one's phenomenal world)[9] is "felt" to dissolve by itself.[10]

---

[6] *gzhi-med rtsa-bral.* This term has been explained by Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa in *Theg-mchog* II 254 and *Tshig don*, 357 as meaning that "for the supraconscious ecstatic intensity there is no "place" to which it may go back since there is no (ulterior) ground, and that there also is no "place" from which it may originate and grow since there are no roots (to nourish its growth)." In other words, wholeness is not a localizable thing and cannot be contained in wholeness as part of it.

[7] *'gyur-med.* According to Padmasambhava, *sNang-srid kha-sbyor*, fol. 244b, there are six "nonexistent" transformations of which three are ontological ("non-existence of transmigration and transformation", "non-existence of birth and death", and "non-existence of origination and cessation"), and three epistemological ("non-existence by virtue of unthinkability", "non-existence by virtue of non-referentiality", and "non-existence by virtue of inaccessibility by the intellect").

[8] *ma-bcos rgyal-po.* The term *ma-bcos* (*ma-bcos-pa*) "uncontrived" is frequently used by Padmasambhava, *sNang-srid kha-sbyor*, fol. 244b, in such phrases as *blo-yis ma-bcos* "not contrived by the intellect" and *blo-yis bcos-med* "not existing (as something) contrived by the intellect" (ibid., fol. 236b), and *blo-yis bcos-su ma sems-cig* "do not think of it as something that can be contrived (and if necessary be "fixed") by the intellect" (on p. 36 in vol. 6 of the Thimpu edition of this text). The associative sequence of *ma-bcos* and *rgyal-po* — two ideas juxtaposed and not just a noun qualified by an adjective — which I have tried to intimate by rendering it as above, occurs twice again in this text, and is used by Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa once in his *Chos-dbyings* IX 21h, p. 181 and in his *Nam-mkha' rab-'byams*, p. 409. The "king" is a symbol of the sovereignty of the whole in its ecstatic intensity — *rig-pa'i rgyal-po* in *Zab-yang* I, 271 — and, psychologically speaking, is the *Self* that, according to Carl Gustav Jung, *Psychology and Alchemy*, p. 41, "... should be understood as the totality of the psyche. The self is not only the centre, but also the whole circumference which embraces both conscious and unconscious; it is the centre of this totality, just as the ego is the centre of consciousness." Similarly Martin Heidegger categorically states on p. 322 in volume 65 of the German *Gesamtausgabe*: "Das *Selbst* ist nie ein >Ich<" (the *Self* is never an "ego"). Just as the king is a symbol for the whole's Ek-stasis, so a symbol for the king is the *khyung-(chen)* — "a giant eagle" in common parlance. See Padmasambhava's *sGron-ma 'od-'bar*, fol. 320b.

[9] *cog-gzhag.* It follows from the idea of (an) ecstatic (supraconscious) intensity, experienced as (one's) Self, regulating (one's) psychic life, and symbolically spoken of as the king, ordering and overseeing the affairs of his kingdom, that its very dynamics sets up and allows intensities to pass that in their ecstatic-horizontal — and hence intrinsically ecstatic — projections "constitute" what we call "all that is" (*chos thams-cad*, in archaic language *cog*). These projections-intensities "imaged" as things and persons, but "felt" (experienced) as intensities have been aptly described as the whole's display of itself in the manner of an enchanting spectacle (*sgyu-ma*). It is one's failure to understand this enchanting "presencing" due to a drop in the

[Summing up the above by a commitment to write about it]

3 Listen to (my account of how I have understood this my) own most unique ability-to-be[11] into which the whole of my phenomenal and noumenal reality has since time before time[12] dissolved (over and

original-originary intensity that leads to its mistaken material and not-quite-so-material concretizations. On the part of the experiencer this inner dynamic of wholeness (Being) is to be *re*-lived by imaginative devices that serve to *re*-intensify the experiential process (*gzhag-thabs*). Rong-zom Chos-kyi bzang-po (eleventh century) restricts himself to only one such device enabling the experiencer to "see" all that is in the manner of an enchanting display (*bKa'-'bum*, pp. 256f. Śrīsiṃha(before or about the time of Padmasambhava) speaks of three devices in his *Ye-shes gsang-ba sgron-me*, fol. 253b:

> An eagle hovering in the sky (*mkha'-la kyung lding*),
> A falcon settling in its nest (*thi bya tshang-du 'jug-pa*),
> A person who has done with toiling (*bya-ba btang-ba'i skyes-bu*).

Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa also speaks of three devices in his *Zab-yang* II, 73 and describes them equally picturesquely as

> Like clouds (coming and going) in the sky (*nam-mkha' sprin ltar*),
> Like a water-mill (that stops by itself) when the water is turned off (*chu-chad rang-'thag ltar*),
> Like a person who has finished his work (*las-zin-pa'i skyes-bu ltar*).

However, in his *Bla-yang*, *Theg-mchog*, *Tshig-don*, and *Chos-dbyings* he speaks of four such devices, illustrating them by the images of a mountain, a lake, ecstatic intensity, and a lighting-up. None of these devices is intended to produce a fixation or an altered state of consciousness.

10 *rang-grol*. This difficult term, used fourteen times, is the leitmotif of the whole essay. The major difficulty in rendering it adequately lies in the fact that *grol* is not an adjective, accidentally qualifying a noun or substance, but is what Alfred North Whitehead has termed a "vector feeling-tone" inseparable from the act in connection with which it is used, hence, it is an adverb. The term *rang*, as noted previously in note 1, is used to emphasize the independence of the process of anything else such that it intimates *its own* dynamics — *its own most peculiar being-free*. The above rendering of *grol* attempts to convey its verbal and process character, while the use of the word "free" denotes its feeling character.

11 *rang-bzhin*. On the meaning of this term see above note 1.

12 *ye-nas grol-ba*. On the adverbial character of *grol-(ba)* see above note 10. There are two frequently used terms to denote what we refer to as "beginning": *ye-nas* intimates a "beginning before time", "since time before time" and *gdod-nas* intimates "the beginning of time", "since the

again) —

This dimension of my existential reality that lies beyond everything without having had to give up anything,

Thinking's thinking, the king, the ultimate completeness of its own most unique ability-to-be,

The (spiralling) vortex (of energy)[13] that from the beginning has been of exquisite purity[14] and that is lying beyond the reach of representational thought.

---

beginning of time."

[13] *klong*. It is impossible to render this term, specific to sNying-thig (rDzogs-chen) thinking, adequately in any Western language. Primarily it is a concept by intuition and hence is wider in meaning(s) than any concept by postulation. Furthermore, in-tuition is a "seeing and learning from within" with the implication that this seeing and learning is as much "seeing" as it is "feeling." In a holistic way, the in-tuitive meaning of *klong*, never losing its rootedness in the wholeness of our Being/being, seems to be what we nowadays would call "turbulence" of which we know that it is characterized by vortexes and spirals and which allows the whole universe to evolve (to become and in its becoming to change), while yet to remain the same. In the present text the term *klong* occurs nine times, and each time it is qualified by different images of immensities and intensities. My rendering of this term by "vortex" is, in part, due to what William Blake has said in his *Milton* :

> The nature of infinity is this: That everything has its
> Own vortex, and when once a traveller thro' Eternity
> Has pass'd that Vortex, he perceives it roll backward behind
> His path, into a globe itself unfolding like a sun...
> Thus is the heaven a vortex pass'd already, and the earth
> A Vortex not yet pass'd by the traveller thro' Eternity.

[14] *rnam-dag*. The dictionary meaning of this term is "pure" (mechanically rendering the Sanskrit word *viśuddha*). In rDzogs-chen thought the term *rnam* is used to denote "concretely observable aspects" of reality, having an impersonal character and presenting misplaced concretizations of the experiential process. This process is intimated by the term *dag* that, like the term *grol*, has a verbal ("adverbial") character. rDzogs-chen thinkers did not deny (or denigrate) the world and did not attempt to escape from it, but saw it with "fresh eyes" as having symbolic significance.

[A. The conviction that the completeness of Being is not some thing or idea that can be imaged objectively, that in it all intellectual constructs have come to an end, and that it lies beyond the scope of the rational intellect]

[1. An individual's Dasein is not understood by the nine "spiritual" pursuits rooted in the rational intellect of their followers]

[a. An individual's Dasein whose substance is the individual's supraconscious ecstatic intensity is not something that must be"fixed" (simply because it) has never been vitiated][15]

4 Thinking's thinking that is inexpressible by words of mouth, complete since time before time, and (vast like) the sky's immensity
With nothing before it to enact and yet (always) acting without toil, lies beyond all the limits set up by organismic thinking[16],
Unobsessed with whatever has come-to-presence (before it), in its spontaneity roaming far and wide, this (spiralling) vortex of the supraconscious ecstatic intensity
Is such that all that has been ordered (as one's phenomenal world)[17] is "felt" to dissolve by itself,[18] (so that) with one's gaze (lost in) the

---

[15] *bcos-bslad med-pa*. On the meaning of the term *bcos* see above note 8. While *bcos* connotes "constructiveness", *bslad* connotes "destructiveness". Thus Padmasambhava, *sNang-srid kha-sbyor*, fol. 236b, uses the phrase *blo-yis bcos-med / rtog-pas ma-bslad* "it can neither be constructed ("fixed" and/or "improved") intellectually nor can it be ruined ("debased" and/or "vitiated') by the mind's divisive tendencies."

[16] *dran-bsam*. The term "organismic thinking" is an adaption of Erich Jantsch's "organismic mind and mentation" (*The Self-organizing Universe*, 165f., 169f., 172f.). In rDzogs-chen thinking the term *dran* refers to what we would call the instinctual and metabolic. It should, however, be noted that through its dynamics the human individual belongs to both a "rational" (*dran-bsam, dran-rtog*) and a "spiritual" (*dran-rig*) world.

[17] *cog-bzhag*. See above note 9.

[18] *rang-grol*. See above note 10.

clearance of its visual field,[19] there is nothing (that might be said) to be an object of representational thought.

Do not attempt to "fix" or vitiate what is settled in what it is in itself.

[b. "Fixing" it is to fetter it]

A deluded person who has thrown away the very substance (of his being)

Degrades his natural mind into a physician's pannier.[20]

Tinkering and tinkering with (his mind/pannier), he obscures (the whole's) energy (working in and through his) existentiality[21].

For him there is no freedom; rather he fetters himself anew by this tinkering.

---

[19] *cer-mthong*. This term is closely related to *cer-grol*. The above rendering is based on Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa's hermeneutical exegesis in his *Theg-mchog* II, 256f., and *Tshig-don*, 359f.

[20] *sgrin-po'i gzeb bskur*. The rendering of this phrase is tentative. The phrase itself occurs only once in Śrīsiṃha's *Khyung-chen mkha'-lding* [as preserved in Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa's *Bi-ma snying-thig*, vol. 2, p. 386], and wherever Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa quotes this phrase its spelling varies. It is quite likely that by his time the meaning of *sgrin-po* as a physician-surgeon (in Sanskrit and modern Hindi *vaidya*) was already forgotten.

[21] *snying-po'i don*. In this phrase the term *don* refers to the individual's existentiality as the concrete presence of the (cosmo-psychic) energy (*snying-po*). It is a key notion in Padmasambhava's writings. The relationship of *snying-po* with *rig-pa* is illustrated by him, *Nyi-zla'i snying-po*, fol. 39b, in the following image suggesting the modern idea of a field and its excitation:

> In (this cosmo-psychic) energy for which there is no name and which is of an immense depth
> There is (present) a supraconscious ecstatic intensity that is without birth and free from intellectual limitations.

[c. The conviction that since what is settled in itself has been such as having never been vitiated, is (acting) utterly without toil]

6 Where and when (the stress of a person's) intellect has been resolved in what is its heart-felt immensity

There and then (the person has become) his own most unique ability-to-be.[22]. There is (then) no point in tinkering with it (in the mistaken assumption that it could be improved).

This knowledge that what has become visible through an intrapsychic stirring[23] is (the whole's) own purificatory dynamics[24] should not be vitiated by interfering with it (in an attempt to "fix" it so much more so as it) is not going to be changed by what (the intellect believes) has to be (removed and) rejected, is (what is meant by) utter "completeness."

---

[22] *rang-bzhin* . See also above note 1.

[23] The sDe-dge edition reads *'gyur mthong* that does not make any sense. The Zhe-chen edition of this text by a certain Padma dbang-rgyal — a copy of which I gratefully obtained from Dr. Franz-Karl Ehrhard at the Nepal Research Centre at Kathmandu — reads *'gyu mthong* which seems to be a misspelling of Śrīsiṃha's *'gyus mthong* in his *Khyung-chen mkha'-lding*, 385. In the present context Śrīsiṃha's presentation is particularly significant. His words are:

rang-min gzhan-min snang-shes cho-'phrul kyang
'gyus mthong 'dzin daṅg zhen-pa'i gegs bsal-bas
cog-bzhag tshig-tu spros-pa'i mtha' 'gag ste

Although there occurs the magic weaving of one's knowing of what comes-to-presence (in its lighting-up) without being an itself or some other,
It has become visible (perceptible) through a stirring (tremor-like movement in the psyche) but by eliminating the impediments of a subjective grasping and emotional involvement (with what so presences)
The limitations caused by putting into words all that has been ordered (as the phenomenal world) have ceased to operate.

[24] *rang-dag* . This term is formed like *rang-grol*, on which see above note 10. From a dynamic perspective *dag* describes a vector feeling-tone inseparable from the "autopurificatory" process.

[2. A detailed discussion of the fact that the Dasein as the energy in an individual's existentiality is not understood by a rational approach that bases itself on the experiencer's egologically prompted vision[25] of his outer and inner reality and on the equally egologically prompted empathetic appreciation[26] of the transformative vision and the degrees of joy felt]

[a. A general rejection of the egologically prompted transformative vision of reality as not being able to understand the meaning of Dasein owing to its being entangled in the nets of intellectual constructions]

[1. Through such an artificially effected transformative vision release[27] is not won]

7 Will a person longing for his feeling-free[28], but tinkering and tinkering
With the openness of wholeness, (similar to) the vast sky, in which all the concrete things (of one's reality) dissolve,
Ever find release from the postulates of eternity and nihility
When he but brushes aside that which is, into some nothing and then posits this nothing as something that is?

[2. Intellectual-rationalistic imagination is a cage that holds one fettered]

---

[25] *bskyed-rim.* It involves the refinement and transformation of the experientially initiated potentialities of experience in the specific life-forms to the effect that ordinary perception is transmuted into the vision of living beings as divine presences, that ordinary talk is transmuted into communication, and that ordinary thinking is transmuted into an originary awareness.

[26] *rdzogs-rim.* It involves the experiencer's feeling himself into his corporeal schema and sensing its lines of force and the currents moving along them with the information these currents carry, leading through a progressive irrealization of the material world to a deeply realized experience of oneself as a luminous being.

[27] *thar-pa.* This term denotes a static end-state and differs from *grol* which as a vector feeling-tone describes *process* .

[28] *grol-ba.* See also the previous note for the difference between a static end-state — it does not make any difference whether a person is physically or spiritually dead — and the dynamic ability to be, *being-free-for the possibilities that we are.*

8 That which has been utterly complete since time before time (and is such that for it) there is no (other) ground (than its own completeness) and (hence also) is without roots[29],

Is not something to be intellectually-rationalistically imagined as some nothingness or some presence, something existent or something nonexistent.

Where there is such fancying there is some (preconceived) envisioning and an engagement in the horizon set by it,

There is some interpretation of what has-come-to-presence (and as a result) there is the frustration of samsara.

Where there is an ideology there is an ardent pursuit of it;

There is the cage of the emotions and there is their fettering (us).

[3. The conviction that the getting rid of the dictates of the intellect is (Being's) intentionality[30] in its Dasein]

9 For him in whom there is no longer the slightest preoccupation with (any) spiritual pursuit's claim, since

He has done with the obsession of attaining a goal that is without (any)

---

[29] On this phrase *gzhi-med rtsa-bral* see above note 6.

[30] *dgongs-pa.* In its specific sNying-thig (rDzogs-chen) usage this term corresponds to the idea of "intentionality" as developed and explicated by Martin Heidegger:

> Intentionality is not an extant relation between an extant subject and an extant object but is constitutive for the relational character of the subject's comportment as such. As the structure of subject-comportment, it is not something immanent to the subject which would then need supplementation by a transcendence; instead, transcendence, and hence intentionality, belongs to the nature of the entity that comports itself intentionally. Intentionality is neither something objective nor something subjective in the traditional sense.
>
> (*The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, pp. 313-314)

ground (to start with) and (at which) the way (to it) stops,[31]

There is no karmic blundering and there is no shrouding (of his being) by the consequences into which this blundering matures;

Rather, he finds (and lives) his being-and-feeling-free in the dimension of (Being's) wholeness (that is as vast as) the sky, by neither continuing in a state of enworldeness nor continuing in a state of quiescence.

[b. A detailed rejection of the egologiclaly prompted empathic appreciation of the transformative vision by exposing its inability to understand the meaning of Dasein.

This inability is due to its being fettered by its assumption of the (whole's) effectiveness principle (*thabs*)[32] and the (whole's) awareness intensification (*shes-rab*)[33] being referential in character and by relishing their objectifications[34]]

[1. A general discussion of the fact that the meaning of Dasein is not understood by combining the

---

31 *gzhi-bral lam-'gags.* This term must not be confused with the term *gzhi-med* that, as we have noted, intimates that for wholeness there is no ground other than itself. By contrast *gzhi-bral* intimates the "groundlessness" of metaphysical or any other hypothetical assumption. The term *lam-'gags* intimates a rejection of a way (or even The Way) as an inert link between two points. The "way" is the *going* and this goes on and on.

32 In the present context this term is understood as an aspect of a whole system as which a living human being may be seen. It does not refer to intellectual expediency as which this term is often misunderstood. In the narrower sense it means the "acting out" of one's instinctual nature, linked to the world of an individual's desires, mostly sexual, and the objects believed to be able to fulfil this urge.

33 Like the previous term (*thabs*), this term, too, is understood in the present context as an aspect of the individual as a living "system". It operates as "appreciation" that is as much physiological as it is psychological.

34 Both *thabs* and *shes-rab* constitute a complementarity and are dialectically related. Without *thabs* there can be no *shes-rab*, and without *shes-rab* there can be no *thabs*. Their dialectic stems from the fact that both are positive aspects of wholeness. To give an example highlighting the Western and Eastern preoccupation with sex (that many people still believe to be all what Tantra is about): when a man becomes aware (*shes-rab*) of a woman's genitals, what he becomes aware of is the *thabs* in his genitals, aroused by the woman's genitals.

experiences of (i) pleasure, (ii) lucidness, and (iii) undividedness-by-concepts with reductionist concretizations]

[(i) pleasure]

10 There are those who declare that the cause for their (existential feeling of) being-free is summed up in the statement about there being (some) pleasure (being bodily felt) and (some) nothingness (mentally postulated and judged as such)[35], involving

The refinement and efficient working of the lines of force (that constitute their corporeal schema) and of the currents (moving along these lines) as well as the control over (the direction into which the) psychic energy[36] (is to move) and

The degrees of intensities (experienced) in the joy, heightened joy, ante-climax joy and the joy in the spontaneity (of the orgasm)

As these develop in the pleasure of the two sex organs joining.

Will these people ever be able to go anywhere beyond the realm of desires?[37]

---

[35] This statement attempts to express what we would call a dialectical synthesis of opposites which, as Erich Jantsch, *The Self-organizing Universe*, 274, is "that clumsy Western attempt at making a rigid structure of notions move and overcome its dualism." The "rigid structure" is in the present case indicated by the dualism of "pleasure" (bde) and "nothing(ness)" (*stong*).

[36] Strictly speaking the overall psychic energy is here conceived of in its narrower sense of (the system's, the human being's) organizing principle (*bkod-pa*), otherwise also called "information" (*thig-le*) that in its movement (*rlung*) sets up its own lines of force or "trajectories" (*rtsa*).

[37] This rendering is based on the version in the sDe-dge edition. The version in the Zhe-chen edition reads *'da' mi-nus* instead of *'da'-bar nus*, which would mean that they "will never be able to go anywhere beyond the realm of desires." This realm is termed *'dod-khams* (Skt. *kāmadhātu* or *kāmaloka*). The implied rejection of sex is not a rejection of human sexuality, but is aimed at the objectivist's engaging in sex with a female partner as a sex *object* (*las-kyi phyag-rgya*, Skt. *karmamudrā*) and his obliviousness of the gestalt quality of sex that expresses itself in and

Through a bogus nothingness genuine feeling-of-being-free does not come about.

[(ii) lucidness]

11 Those who fancy their (subjective) mind to be the *lumen naturale* or tinker with the luminescence of the colors of the organism's vibrations
As they light up before the senses (prior to their becoming misconstrued as) objective "realities" and
Declare this to be (what is meant by) undividedness-by-concepts[38],
Are entrenched in their belief in the existence of (some) apprehendable (thing) and some apprehending agency[39]
Having been fettered by the chain (of this dichotomy),
Will there be for them any feeling-of-being-free from the realm of

---

through the complementarity of masculinity and femininity (*yab-yum*). Ridiculing the objectivist's obsession with the merely physiological aspect of sex, Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa quotes in his *Yid-bzhin*, 666, the stanzas 1 and 4 in chapter VII of Indrabhūti's *Jñānasiddhi*:

> Some lowly people claim the pleasure that derives from the rubbing together of the two sex organs to be the real thing;
> This the sublime victorious ones have never declared to be bliss supreme.
>
> Never is bliss supreme transitory, permanent is bliss supreme.
> How can (the relief one feels) by scratching (one's) leprous armpits be this (bliss).
> This has nothing to do with bliss supreme.

38 Strictly speaking this state, highly coveted by practitioners of Yoga, is here merely anticipated and the visionary, aesthetic experience in which what on the experiencer's ordinary, materialistic outlook was his belief in materiality, now dissolving into the immateriality of sheer luminescence is confused with the coveted state — a clear case of psychological self-deception.

39 *gzung 'dzin*. While Western thinking is still in the grip of the myth of materiality, Buddhist thinking has discarded this untenable myth long ago. Both *gzung* and *'dzin* are "projections" of what is usually referred to as "mind". But this does not mean that they are "mental"; rather, they are more like concrete instances of intensities.

aesthetic forms?[40]

[(iii) undividedness-by-concepts]

12 Even if people fancy a mental state that is non-referential and without any imagery,

Once their body has been forced into a rigid posture, speech has been restrained, mind has (been brought under control and) become concentrated, and its dichotomic thinking has been repressed,[41]

They will continue wandering about in the four infinity feelings that make up the realm of no-forms,[42] and

Never will there be for them any feeling-of-being-free.

[2. A detailed explanation of the fact that (those who find themselves in any of) these three realms will not pass beyond their specific situation]

---

[40] This realm which is the next higher one in the triarchic organization of an individual and his environment, is technically known as *gzugs-(kyi) khams* (Skt. *rūpadhātu*, *rūpaloka*). The Sanskrit term *rūpa* comprises both color (*varṇa*) and shape (*saṃsthāna*). The vibrations and their colors to which this stanza alludes, are related to the fundamental forces or formative processes (*'byung-ba*) that shape the psychophysical complexity of the individual as well the environment of which he is a part. For details see my *The Creative Vision*.

[41] The description of this state as offered here is a phenomenological account of what in modern psychology is called the absolute (or detection) threshold — "the statistically determined point along a stimulus continuum at which the energy level is just sufficient for one to detect the presence of the stimulus" (Arthur S. Reber, *The Penguin Dictionary of Psychology*, 773).

[42] *gzugs-med-kyi khams*. This is the literal translation of Skt. *arūpadhātu* or *arūpaloka*. This realm is also known as *ārūpyadhātu* because there is still some referential aspect to it (see Louis de la Vallée Poussin, *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu*, VIII 135 n.). It has been the topic of extensive reductionist speculations. The four infinity feelings reflect an oscillation between the "object"-phase and the "act"-phase in the intentional structure of perception such that the first infinity feeling, termed "space", indicates the object-phase as being referential, though not objectifiable; the second infinity feeling, termed "consciousness", indicates the act-phase; the third infinity feeling, termed "nothing-whatsoever", indicates the object-phase as being nonreferential and nonobjectifiable, and the fourth infinity feeling indicates the act-phase, the nonapplicability of concepts and nonconcepts. On the terms object-phase and act-phase see Edward S. Casey, *Imagining*, xv and *passim*.

13 Apart from wandering about in the possible realms of desires, aesthetic forms, and no-forms in which
Each (so-patterned) mind presents its probabilistic level of pleasure, luminescence, and dichotomy suspension, (respectively),
There is for these people no chance of having a feeling-of-being-free.
This state of affairs applies to the addicts of extremes[43] as well.
So, what is the difference of such people from other people?

[3. Rejecting the acceptance of the above]

14 Moreover, even if it is claimed that the purpose is to fancy all this as a nothing,
By tinkering and tinkering (with wholeness) and fancying it as a nothing,
That which might (by ordinary standards) be a positive and healthy idea (turns out to be that person's) intellectual involvement with an overevaluation that fetters him (to it);
What benefit derives from a nothing that is not settled in (that person's) own most unique ability-to-be?[44]
The sequence of thoughts forming a motley of positive and negative ideas
Again and again lays the foundation for the city of samsara:
Thinking positively leads to the two happy forms of life, heaven and the

---

43 "Addicts of extremes" is a literal translation of the Tibetan term *mu-stegs-pa* that itself is a hermeneutical interpretation of Skt. *tīrthika*, normally used to include all non-Buddhists. Traditionally four "extremes", each forming a complementarity, have been listed: origination-cessation (*skye-'gag*), eternity-nihility (*rtag-chad*), existence-nonexistence (*yod-med*), and phenomenality-nothingness (*snang-stong*).

44 What Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa wants to say is that "nothing" as a rational concept set absolute impoverishes and fragments wholeness. The rational approach perpetuates the separation between the experiencer and the experienced that is "experienced" from a specific point of view that sacrifices many of the integral aspects of reality.

human world,

Thinking negatively leads to the three unhappy forms of life;

Traversing them one after the other, one is unable to cross the river of samsara.

[3. A summary of the thesis that the inability of the intellect-dominated "spiritual" careers with their emphasis on causality to understand Dasein leads to a renewed involvement in samsara]

[a. Wholeness or Dasein goes beyond (the local determinism of) causality and is (as vast and open) as the sky]

15 Where good and evil as the causal momentum for one's blunders no longer exists,

There is no wandering about in samsara as the effect set up by this momentum.

(This open dimension) is like the sky; what can shroud it?[45]

---

[45] This idea of wholeness being "beyond" the reductive determinism of causality — "beyond" meaning "irreducible to any postulate of reason" — has been poetically developed by Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa in his *gNas-lugs* I vs. 38-39, pp. 68f.:

> (The whole's) self-evolved ecstatic intensity, the real sun,
> Is shrouded in both the white and black clouds of good and evil.
> Unleashed by the lightning of yearning, one's laborious struggling with acceptance and rejection,
> The torrential rain of the mistaken notions of happiness and sorrow is pouring down and
> The seeds of samsara yield the foliage of the six kinds of living beings.
> Alas! How pitiable are the six kinds of living beings in their misery.
>
> Just as a chain of gold and a rope of straw are alike in fettering
> The (whole's) core intensity that inexorably impels us to bring our potential into full play,
> So also the moral and the immoral are alike in fettering one's mind.
> Just as the mass of white and black clouds is alike in shrouding the sun,
> So also good and evil are alike in shrouding (the whole's) ecstatic intensity in us.
> Therefore for a visionary who is about to understand wholeness
> It is important that he goes beyond all good and evil that act both as cause and effect.

[b. Causality perpetuates samsara by "looking for something to do"[46]]

16 Apart from drifting about and wearing himself out on the ocean of worldliness,
A person looking for a sense-specific harbor (that promises the) end of his toils,
Will not be able to reach the opposite shore of the ocean, emancipation.
As long as there is a mind imaginatively working with sense-specific objects,
(Anything sense-specific) will be attained through concerted efforts, but so long also
There is no means to have the feeling-of-being-free from what is the very constitution of samsara[47]

---

[46] *bya-btsal.* Literally. "searching for what must be done from an egological perspective"

[47] This is an extremely "packed" stanza. On the one hand, it presents the position of the traditional epistemology-oriented and pre-eminently speculative schools of Buddhism and, on the other hand, offers a summary critique of them from a point of view rooted in experience. For the traditional schools the goal they aimed at was an "objective" reality, regardless of whether this reality was conceived of as being of a concrete-material or mental-imaginal nature. Furthermore, according to their linear and rationalistic way of thinking this goal was "located" somewhere on the other shore of the ocean whose currents held the experiencer prisoner on this side of it and made him "run around in circles" (*samsara*). If the experiencer should be so lucky as to escape the coercive force of the "ocean of worldliness" (*srid-pa'i rgya-mtsho*) — from a dynamic perspective *srid-pa* denotes the process of becoming enworlded — and reach the opposite shore, he would have reached the end of his toils and find himself in a static end-state, variously called "release" (*thar-pa*, emphasizing its concrete-"material" nature as postulated by the realist) or "emancipation" (*rnam-grol*, emphasizing its abstract-"mental-imaginal" nature as postulated by the mentalist) of which all speculative schools held different opinions as detailed by Rong-zom Chos-kyi bzang-po in his *bKa'-'bum*, 167-168. The critique of all these notions is implied, firstly, by the emphasis on experience, indicated by the use of the term *grol* which describes a vector feeling-tone that is inseparable from the experience (see also above note 10); secondly, by assigning the same position to the term "ocean" (*rgya-mtsho*) in the two expressions: *srid-pa'i rgya-mtsho* and *rnam-grol rgya-mtsho*. Thereby emphasis is placed on worldliness, on the one hand, on emancipation, on the other hand. While the rendering of *srid-pa'i rgya-mtsho* by "ocean of worldliness" may be said to be grammatically correct, it fails to convey the intended meaning which is "the ocean whose hither shore is worldliness." Similarly, the intended meaning of *rnam-grol rgya-mtsho* is "the ocean whose yonder shore is emancipation." In this manner emancipation and worldliness are shown to be of the same nature: postulates of the individual's rational (and

[c. The fact that there is nothing to do is (the whole's) initial nothingness/energy field in the concrete] [48]

17 The soaring of the ecstatic (supraconscious) intensity's creative dynamics[49] into the (immensity of the) sky as its cognitive domain

Marks the moment when the king[50] with nothing sense-specific before him and without apprehending (anything) in the manner of an egological subject has made his appearance (as a felt presence).

Having by himself (retrieved the integrity of) his feeling-free from his enworldedness that is the duality of a subject over and against an object,

He (now) abides in the dimension that throughout the three aspects of time never steps out of itself nor changes into something other than itself[51].

---

hence limited and limiting) consciousness. The ocean itself is thus the link between the opposites of worldliness and emancipation. Its "independent" force is later on in the text compared to a vortex (*klong*).

[48] *gdod-ma'i gshis*. On the term *gshis* see also note 1. The term *gdod-ma* — actually a noun, but here rendered as an adjective — indicates a "beginning" in the sense of Being's pure potential having become an actuality. The above sentence is reminiscent of Meister Eckhart's statement: "Godhead does nothing, there is nothing it can do, and never has it looked for anything to do" (translation by C. de B. Evans, *Works*, I, 143).

[49] *rig-pa'i rtsal*. In the present context this term is an allusion to the *khyung-chen* bird hovering in the sky. Since the *khyung-chen* is "the king of the birds", its image subtly leads over to the "king" here on earth, explicitly mentioned in the following line.

[50] *rgyal-po*. See above note 8. The meaning is that at this moment one's authentic Self symbolically referred to as the king who is both the expression and the expressed of the whole's ecstatic intensity, has taken over and orders the experiencer's whole life.

[51] This dimension is Being's (the whole's) field-like expanse saturated with meanings (*chos-kyi dbyings*) whose immensity is likened to the vast expanse of the sky, mentioned in connection with the *khyung-chen* bird, a symbol of the whole's supraconscious ecstatic intensity.

[d. Nonexertion is the whole's intentionality[52] with everything (disruptive) having come to an end][53]

18 On him whose heart has been infected by the poison of drudgery,
The world's frustrating suffering falls like rain.
When there is no drudgery (one is) the king (and) without the urge to do something one's mind feels perfectly happy;[54]
When there is the feeling-of-being-free[55] (operative all) by itself (one is) the king, and having won the assurance of (one's) being identical with the whole,[56]

---

[52] See above note 30.

[53] *zad-pa'i dgongs-pa.* On *dgongs-pa* see above note 30. The term *zad-pa* implies that all that is disruptive, even the whole's possibilizing dynamics, has come to an end. In colloquial diction we might say: "it's all over." Paradoxically speaking, this "it's all over" is not the end of the matter, for what is "left" is pure energy, pure intensity.

[54] This happiness is of three kinds as Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa explains in his *Bla-yang* I, 423f.: (1) one's mind is happy because, through the deeply felt understanding that there is nothing to Being's errancy mode, there is no longer any roaming about in any of the three levels of samsaric existence; (2) one's mind is happy because one's obsession with the belief in material realities has ceased after the collapse of the mistaken notions of philosophical systems through the deeply felt understanding that there is no substance to the ideas they entertain; and (3) one's mind is happy because one does no longer take what someone says as an article of faith; one knows that one will not become spiritually awake by chasing after the words that merely voice subjective ruminations because they do not touch the core of the matter.

[55] *rang-grol.* See above note 10.

[56] *mnyam-pa'i gdeng*. Identical/identity (*mnyam*) must here be understood dynamically, not statically. The "king" is the whole (Being) and yet only part (being) of it. In the words of Erich Jantsch, *Design for Evolution*, 99:

> ... we *are* the stream, source and flow, carrier and carried, the whole stream and yet only part of it — as a water molecule is the river and yet only part of it.

The technical term *gdeng*, here rendered as "assurance" deriving from deep within one's self, points to the experiencer's structural potential involving his disposition and openness-to-Being (*ngang*) that *prefigures* a possible movement into his *Dasein* (*rang-bzhin*) with its endowment with existential possibilities as the potential-for-being that "results" in the spontaneous

The moving to and fro of (one's) thoughts arises as the frolicking of (the whole's) originary awareness:
(This means that) one has arrived at the primordial level (of one's being) where no errancy obtains —
One has found one's life's meaning, self-evolved[57] and spontaneously present.

[e. The advice to heed what cannot be "fixed" and must not be vitiated]

19 He who in his (egocentric) mind would like (to know) who this feeling-of-being-free is

---

presence of his authentic Self (*bdag-nyid chen-po*). A lengthy discussion of this structural potential is found in Padmasambhava's *sPros-bral*, fols. 48b, 57b and Rong-zom Chos-kyi bzang-po's *bKa'-'bum*, 253.

[57] *rang-byung*. A lengthy hermeneutical explication of this term has been given by Padmasambhava in his *sNang-srid*, fols. 257b-258a. His explication involves two levels: the level of Being itself in its dynamic wholeness and the level of one's "diminished" being or mentation. To quote a few salient explications; of the former he says:

> *rang* denotes the primordial ground (*gzhi*) that has existed since time before time,
> *byung* denotes this (ground) in its momentariness.
> *rang* denotes the insubstantial, all-encompassing ground,
> *byung* denotes the breeze-like stirring residing in this ground.
> . . . .
> *rang* denotes a circle of light,
> *byung* denotes the spreading of rays from this light.

In this spreading of rays the original intensity becomes diminished so that the rays are not recognized (*ma-rig-pa*) for what they are, and so Padmasambhava continues:

> *rang* denotes lack of cognitive intensity (and clarity, *ma-rig*), the gate through which one goes astray,
> *byung* denotes (the whole's) turning into (some feeble) excitation (*rig*), one's egocentric mind (*yid*), and one's egologically oriented mentation (*sems*).
> *rang* denotes the three modes of going astray,
> *byung* denotes the roaming about in the three levels of enworldedness.
> *rang* denotes one's own mind,
> *byung* denotes the crowd of (its) eighty-thousand notions.
> *rang* denotes the non-ecstatic samsaric mind,
> *byung* denotes (its) eighty-thousand pollutants (emotions).

Should not (egocentrically) attempt to either "fix" or vitiate his natural mind.[58]

[f. A detailed account of the evidence for the above]

20 By tinkering and tinkering (with one's freedom) one certainly fetters (oneself), (therefore)

Do not look for things to do when your mind rejoices in its self-settledness in the dimension

Where the core of (one's) supraconscious ecstatic intensity,[59] uncontrived (as) the king, spontaneous and complete, has settled. In this (time- and space-binding) moment (when everything has been) irrealized,[60]

There is not so much as an atom in it (to allow you) to negate or to affirm what it is (by saying:) "this is it."[61]

Neither has it anything to do with notions of rejection and acceptance (by

---

[58] *gnyug-ma'i sems*. On this term see above note 2.

[59] The whole line is a "string of images" in which each image is of symbolic pregnance. The associative phrase *ma-bcos rgyal-po* has already been used by Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa in the "longer" invocation, preceding this essay. "Spontaneity (and) completeness" (*lhun-rdzogs*) describes, as is to be expected in this context, an experience that carries with it the sense of an ontological freedom that is its spontaneity and the feeling of wholeness that is its completeness. "The core (of the whole's) ecstatic intensity" (*rig-pa'i gnad*) emphasizes the whole's supraconscious ecstatic intensity (*rig-pa*) that lets the whole come and be alive.

[60] *zang-thal*. This technical term depicts the process of an intertwining of one's own being with the dynamics of Being as a whole, of which Padmasambhava (*sNang-srid kha-sbyor*, fol. 261b) had already spoken in terms of our whole body's sensory complexity becoming originary awareness modes.

[61] This line is taken over from Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa's *Sems-nyid rang-grol*, 199.

stating that) this "this is it" (must or must) not exist[62].

In this dimension in which (the postulates of) a starting-point (for the individuation process), a way (along which it travels), and a goal (at which it arrives) have all dissolved,[63]

The king as the freedom that he is by himself, does not step out of it (himself) nor changes into something other than it (himself) throughout the three aspects of time.

Inexpressible by words of mouth, beyond representational thought — (such is one's) *Da*-sein with (what eventually constitutes our phenomenal and noumenal) reality already fully pre-existent,[64] the (spiralling) vortex of (one's) natural mind.[65]

There is no (*thing*ish) feeling-of-being-free since there exists not so much as an atom to constitute a ground or reason for (there being) some (*thing*ish) feeling-of-being-free;

There does not exist anything to be looked at, there does not exist anything to be seen, there does not exist anything to be pointed out by

---

62 Negation and affirmation belong to the level of rationality, rejection and acceptance belong to the level of emotionality. Both levels diminish and prescind from a person's fulness of existing; the one perpetuates the objectivist's fallacies, the other perpetuates the subjectivist's fallacy that only too often is just that person's *idée fixe* .

63 This line is taken over by Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa from his *Chos-nyid rang-grol*, 251. Compare with this statement Heidegger's remarks in his *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, 276:

> If the Dasein is free for definite possibilities of itself, for its ability to be, then the Dasein is in this *being-free-for*; it is these possibilities themselves. They *are* only as possibilities of the existent Dasein in whatever way the Dasein may comport to them. The possibility is in every instance that of one's own most peculiar being.

64 *gzhi-rdzogs.* See above note 4.

65 *gnyug-ma'i klong.* On *gnyug-ma* see above note 2.

metaphors;

(What there is) lies beyond the domain of representational thought and, hence, is not a thing that can be thought about.

[B. The beholdenness[66] of life's meaning[67] as an un-limiting vectorial flow[68] to (its character of being) an expanding (spiralling) vortex (of sheer intensities][69]

---

66 *'gag-bsdams-pa*. Literally this compound means "to stop (at) and be tied to (where one has stopped)". In a wider sense this compound attempts to convey the insight that David Michael Levin, *The Opening of Vision* , 256, has expressed in the following words:

To behold is to be *held* by what one sees. To behold is, in this sense, to be also *beheld*. Conversely, since the beheld is that which *holds* our gaze — holds it, sometimes, and binds it under a spell, it is also true to say that the beheld is also the one beholding. In beholding, though, we are held not only by what we have beheld; we are held at the same time by the entire world of visibility; and ultimately, by the field of its lighting.

67 *dgongs-pa*. See above note 30 for the "literal" meaning of this term. A freer rendering as adopted here, is "life's meaning" of which the experiencer is an integral aspect.

68 *mtha'-grol*. A lengthy hermeneutical explication of this technical term has been given by Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa, *Theg-mchog* II, 269f. The term itself occurred first with Padmasambhava, *lTa-ba-la shan-byed*, fols. 108b and 116b, where it is used in connection with *klong*. The "limits" (*mtha'*) or "alternatives between which rational thought oscillates" (*mu*) are the four categories of "existence," "nonexistence," "both existence and nonexistence together," and "neither existence nor nonexistence together." The cessation of their haunting one's egocentric and egological mind is termed *grol*.

69 According to Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa's own analytical summary of contents this part consists of six sections, each having a specific title outlining the contents. However, only the first three (a-c) are identifiable; the second three (d-f) pose a problem that cannot be solved until a different version is found. The titles of the second three sections are the same as the ones of the first three. Possibly the person who carved the blocks for printing was interrupted in his work and when he resumed it he started where he had begun without checking what he had already done. Also, the glosses to indicate the verse lines with which the stanzas begin, do not tally with the actual sequence of these lines in the body of the text. In the present translation I have followed Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa's text as it exists and separated the second three sections according to main topics and on the basis of stylistic considerations. While Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa lists five "vortexes", of paramount importance are the three that are likened to the immensity of the sky (*nam-mkha'*), the depth of the ocean (*rgya-mtsho*), and the brilliance of sun and moon (*nyi-zla*). As "concretely" felt images they are flanked, as it were by the "abstract", albeit no less intensely felt, images of ubiquity and inseparability. The three "concretely" felt vortexes are already found with Padmasambhava and elucidated in his *rGyud-kyi rtse-rgyal Nyi-zla 'od-'bar mkha'-klong*

[a. A brief statement about the substance of life's meaning as an expanding (spiralling) vortex]

21 (Life's meaning) in transcending the four (limiting) alternatives (of rational thought) —

Neither (something) existent nor nonexistent, neither (something) being both (existent and nonexistent) together nor being neither (existent and nonexistent) together —

Is (termed) the ubiquity (spiralling) vortex;[70]

In its own most unique ability-to-be, (its) spontaneity and completeness, (its) non-birth — (life's meaning) is (termed) the sky (spiralling) vortex;[71]

With its depth and width to which no limiting alternatives (of rational thought) apply, (its) preciousness — (life's meaning) is (termed) the

---

rnam-dag rgya-mtsho klong-gsal, fols. 133b-134a.

70 *gdal-ba-chen-po'i klong*. On the meaning of the term *gdal-ba-chen-po* see above note 2. These two lines are a repudiation of the negativistic-reductionist Madhyamaka system.

71 *rang-bzhin lhun-rdzogs skye-med nam-mkha'i klong*. On *rang-bzhin* see above note 1. In sNying-thig (rDzogs-chen) thought the term *skye-med* "non-birth" is an ontological concept in its own right, not an adjective qualifying a substance or some thing. Wholeness, in Heideggerian terms "Being", is not a thing and the irreducibility of its lived experience to any concrete thing is then likened to and expressed by the visual image of the sky (*nam-mkha'*) whose immensity and dynamics is "felt" as a vortex of intensities (*klong*). A lengthy hermeneutical interpretation has been given by Padmasambhava in the seventeenth chapter of his *sNying-po bcud-spungs*, from which the following quotation is taken (fol. 342b):

> An analogy for mind (*sems*) is the sky (*nam-mkha'*),
> But the sky is without anything to pinpoint it (as some thing):
> *nam* means that it is non-birth [i.e, it is such (*yin*) that for it there does not exist (*med*) anything called "birth"]
> *mkha'* means that it is non-cessation [i.e, it is such that for it there does not exist anything called "cessation'].
> This sky for which there does not exist the duality of birth and cessation
> Is gathered in the vortex (*klong*) that is the (whole's) giving birth to thoughts/meanings (*chos-nyid*) that (itself) is (sheer) energy (*snying-po*).

ocean (spiralling) vortex;[72]

In its own most unique ability-to-be, (as) the *lumen naturale*,[73] the paradox of there being a lüminous presence that yet is nothing — (life's meaning) is (termed) the sun-and-moon (spiralling) vortex;[74]

---

[72] *gting-mtha' mu-med rin-chen rgya-mtsho'i klong*. On the material level the term *rin-chen* denotes precious things such as gold, silver, coral, pearl, and gem. On the psychic-spiritual level this term denotes "probabilistic unfoldment modalities" (*yon-tan*) that manifest themselves as "originary aware modes" (*ye-shes*), "luminosity" (*'od*), "supraconscious ecstatic intensity" (rig-pa), "supremacy of spirituality" (*thugs-rje*), "the coming-to-presence of (what is deemed to be tangibly) existent (*yod-par snang-ba*); "unknowing (as a drop in the supraconscious ecstatic intensity" (*ma-rig-pa*), "karmic blundering" (*las*), and the probability of "becoming spiritually awake" (*sangs-rgyas*) or of "continuing with one's opinions" (*sems-can*). See *mKha'-yang* II, 101. An image for the wealth and depth of these precious (*rin-chen*) capabilities (*yon-tan*) is the ocean (*rgya-mtsho*) whose ceaseless surging is "felt" as a vortex of intensities. Padmasambhava (*Nyi-zla'i snying-po*, fol. 38a) speaks of the ocean as being the elixir of life; whoever drinks from it will not only get healthy, but even pass beyond birth and death. For him (*Nyi-zla'i snying-po*, fol. 27b) the sky-like expanding vortex of the intensities of wholeness corresponds to "vision" (*lta-ba*) and the ocean-like expanding vortex of the intensities of wholeness corresponds to "the cultivation of the vision by active imagination" (*sgom-pa*). A lengthy hermeneutical interpretation of the ocean (spiralling) vortex has been given by Padmasambhava in his *rGyud-kyi rtse-rgyal Nyi-zla 'od-'bar mkha'-klong rnam-dag rgya-mtsho klong-gsal*, fol. 134a.

[73] *'od-gsal*. This term is actually a compound of *'od* and *gsal*. Grammatically this compound can be translated as "radiant light", but like all grammatically correct translations it fails to convey its intention. The term *'od* denotes a supraluminous intensity that becomes "radiant" (*gsal*) when it crosses the instability threshold and moves, in terms of quantum theory, out of a "state" of pure potentiality into a "state" of actuality. The deeper implication of this compound is that we as human beings are *luminous* beings by virtue of being manifestations of Being's supraluminal intensity.

[74] *rang-bzhin 'od-gsal snang-stong nyi-zla'i klong*. The term *snang-stong* describes the paradox of there being a presence (*snang-ba*) while yet there is nothing (*stong-pa*), which is not some demonstrable thing, but an experiential fact. "Sun-and-moon" (*nyi-zla*), the two great luminaries, illustrate the dispelling of one's spiritual darkness, both in its overt and latent state. According to Padmasambhava (*Nyi-zla'i snying-po*, fol. 38a) the sun as the light that is the glare of the phenomenal (*snang-gsal*) dispels the darkness of unknowing, and the moon as the light that is (the whole's) luminosity (*'od-gsal*), one's *lumen naturale*, dispels the obscurations that constitute one's propensity to be un-knowing or, as we would say nowadays, forgetful of our luminous nature. According to Rong-zom Chos-kyi bzang-po, *gSang-'grel*, fol. 44b, sun and moon symbolize our being "marked by" the whole's effectiveness principle (*thabs*) and the whole's awareness intensification principle (*shes-rab*). See above notes 32 and 33. "Sun-and-moon" visibly demonstrate a pervasive field of luminosity and luminescence that as the whole in its being what it is, its "own most unique ability-to-be" (*rang-bzhin*) attunes us as embodied and, therefore, only dimly luminous beings to the more primordial (anthropocosmic) *lumen naturale*. In picturesque language Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa (*Chos-dbyings*, p. 310) refers to the tension

In being uncontrived and the king,[75] (life's meaning) is (termed) the inseparability (spiralling) vortex[76].

[b. The core intensity of these vortexes]

---

between the rational-instinctual and the spiritual in us and the supraconscious ecstatic intensity that we are, temporarily dimmed and made invisible by the predominance of our rational (and not quite so rational) thinking:

> Although the sun-and-moon of (the whole's) supraconscious ecstatic intensity that since time before time has been a sheer lucency (*rig-pa'i nyi-zla ye-nas 'od-gsal-ba*) exist in all sentient beings who live in the darkness of their karmic blundering (*las*) and their emotional vagaries (*nyon-mongs*), this iron house of samsara, it is not visible of its own; rather, its invisibility is due to the fact that, when the rational-instinctual and the spiritual (*dran-rig*) confront their objects, the rational-instinctual in sensory perception takes over and the spiritual, although it over and again comes to the fore in its nakedness, is not recognized because the eye of one's own supraconscious ecstatic intensity (*rang-rig-gi mig*) has been blinded.

The intimate relationship between the whole's ecstatic intensity (*rig-pa*) and one's own ecstatic intensity (*rang-rig*), to which Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa alludes, reflects, on the part of the experiencer. the sensed unity of the "cosmic" and the "local", the individual, in its vast reach as an excitatory process. Every system, large or small, animate or inanimate, has the inherent capacity to hold and increase its level of excitation that is always *its own* (*rang*) and nobody else's excitation (*rig*). Broadly speaking, an increase or intensification of excitation leads to a heightened awareness that, figuratively speaking, lifts the experiencer out of their ordinarily unexcited or pseudo-excited state (*ma-rig-pa*), the "iron house of samsara", to which an individual only too often reverts after moments of ecstasy.

75 *ma-bcos rgyal-po* . See above note 8.

76 *'du-'bral med-pa'i klong*. The phrase *'du-'bral-med-pa* is the short form for the lengthy phrase *sku dang ye-shes 'du-'bral med-pa* which means that the gestalt character of our experience (*sku*) is not something than can be added to or subtracted from the act of experiencing, technically known as "originary awareness" (*ye-shes*). The Tibetan phrase resolves the duality of process and structure into a single dynamic notion, its dynamics being emphasized by speaking of it as a (spiralling) vortex. There exists a subtle logic in the "sequence" of these vortexes that "start", as it were, from the ubiquity of the dynamics of wholeness, (simultaneously) "soar" into the immensity of the sky's expanse and "dive" into the immensity of the ocean's depth, and "re-live" their primordial unity in the individuated Self.

22 Its auto-presencing[77] in the absence of (any) causal momentum and without the latter's (accompanying) modifiers[78] (retains) the purity (it has in what is) its legitimate dwelling[79] (and thus presents)

The core intensity of the supraconscious ecstatic intensity in which all that has been ordered (as one's phenomenal world) dissolves by itself[80] with no obscuration (left behind).[81]

Through a tremor-like intrapsychic stirring,[82] (this core intensity) ceases (to be what it is), but through (its) lighting-up (it dissolves) in what

---

[77] *rang-snang*. This idea of wholeness coming-to-presence by itself reflects the process-oriented thinking of rDzogs-chen that rejects any mechanistic notions of causality. More than anywhere else it is here that our traditional concepts geared to a static world-view turn out to be wholly inadequate.

[78] *rgyu-med rkyen-bral.* Unlike the Western idea of causality as being catenarian (linear), the Buddhist conception has been reticular. It distinguishes between a causal momentum (*rgyu*) and its modifiers (*rkyen*).

[79] *rang-sar dag*. The term *rang-sa*, here rendered as "its legitimate dwelling", occurs frequently in Padmasambhava's writings, the reflexive pronoun *rang* indicating that (the whole's) dwelling in its own and not somebody else's dwelling. In a wider sense this dwelling is the whole in its ecstatic intensity. The term *dag* has a strongly verbal connotation so that the phrase *rang-sar dag* could, and maybe should, be more appropriately rendered as "retaining and regaining its purity (that is, its symbolicalness) in what is its legitimate dwelling". However, while "pure" and/or "purity" are primarily static notions that strongly appeal to our sense of vision, the corresponding dynamic notions that from the sNying-thig (rDzogs-chen) perspective relate to our sense of feeling are "free" and/or "freedom" whose Tibetan term *grol* intimates what we would call a vector feeling-tone. Thus, two lines later Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa uses *rang-sar grol* instead of *rang-sar dag*. In so doing he combines the static "what" with the dynamic "how."

[80] *cog-bzhag rang-grol.* See also above notes 9 and 10.

[81] *sgrib-bral.* There are two kinds of obscurations: the polluting veil of the emotions (*nyon-sgrib*) and the darkening veil of intellectual constructs (*shes-sgrib*).

[82] *'gyus-pas 'gags*. Through this tremor-like intrapsychic stirring, sensed as a subtle flickering or glinting, a symmetry break in the primordial light, the *lumen naturale* (*'od-gsal*, see also above note 73) is effected, leading to its auto-presencing or auto-luminescence that may or may not be misunderstood as something other than what it is.

is its legitimate dwelling.[83]

"Freedom" and "unfreedom" are words used in common parlance, (in what they purport to be) they are like a dream;

What kind of "freedom"-thing can there be in the (whole's) dimension that is without any roots?[84]

All such claims (about freedom being some thing that can be reduced to some other thing) are mere words used in common parlance.

[c. The measure of one's assurances about the Dasein that derives from the above core intensity][85]

23 The (experience of this) supraconscious ecstatic intensity as the king (of

---

[83] *snang-bas rang-sar grol.* On the phrase *rang-sar grol* see above note 79. The lighting-up (*snang-ba*) is an intensification of the subtle glinting that has occurred (*'gyus-pa*). It constitutes a probability phase in the sense that through a deeply felt *understanding* (*rtogs*) it may return to the source from which it lit up or that, through the lack of such understanding, it may become what I shall call "structured light" (*shar*) — *shar* being the past tense of *'char-ba* "to arise". This three-phase diminution of light is not caused, but comes to pass by itself (*rang*) and in so doing sets up a dimension, a field that is not a field in the ordinary sense of the word, as the whole's own playground, as may be gleaned from Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa's words in his *Nam-mkha' rab-'byams* (in: *mKha'-yang* I, 397):

shar-snang-'gyu-ba ye-shes rol-pa'i dbyings

which can only be paraphrased as

> The structured light (into which) the brilliant lighting-up (turns out of) a subtle glinting are (manifestations of) the whole's field-like expanse (as the stage for) the playing of (the whole's) originary awareness.

It may not be without interest to note that the whole line *'gyus-pas 'gags-la snang-bas rang-sar grol* has been taken *verbatim* from Padma-las-'brel-rtsal's (1291-1316) *Nam-mkha' klong-yangs* (in: *mKha'-yang* I, 411-426), 415.

[84] *rtsa-bral.* I understand this term as a short form of *gzhi-med rtsa-bral* used before. The point is that this dimension of wholeness that is freedom through and through cannot be rooted in something other than itself without losing its wholeness.

[85] The following five verse lines are probably the profoundest phenomenological descriptions of experience-as-lived ever written.

one's psychic-spiritual life) is, in its nothingness-radiance,[86] the assurance about (one's) humanity;[87]

---

[86] *stong-gsal.* Although rendered as nouns, these terms function like "adverbs", vector feeling-tones that cannot be abstracted from the dynamics of what is referred to as the supraconscious ecstatic intensity (*rig-pa*). Accordingly, the verbal-adverbial character of *stong* is experienced as not allowing any permanent structure to form or, using a Heideggerian term, *nichtet*, that is, "brings to nought" any such structure that may have formed; hence my choice of the word "nothingness" in this context. Similarly, *gsal* refers to the supraconscious ecstatic intensity's dynamics of shedding on its, that is, our world the light of human meaning. Speaking of this light as radiance subtly intimates the joy and "ecstasy" (*bde-ba*) we feel in our own functioning. The indivisibility of *stong* and *gsal* — the paradox of there occurring simultaneously a "bringing to nought" while there is a "shedding of light" — is plainly stated by Śrīsiṃha in connection with the whole's originary awareness (*ye-shes*), itself a function of the supraconscious ecstatic intensity:

> The originary awareness to which (the categories of) negation and affirmation do not apply
> Is not set up by some causal momentum and hence is without its modifiers:
> The indivisibility of nothingness and radiance (*stong-gsal dbyer-med*) has the character of originary awareness.

See his *Nam-mkha' dang mnyam-pa yi-ge-med-pa'i rgyud*, fol. 51b and his *rGya-mtsho dang mnyam-pa rnyogs-pa-med-pa'i rgyud*, fol. 56b (identical with the first occurrence except for the scribe's spelling mistakes).

In *gNas-lugs*, p. 105, Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa declares:

> For the supraconscious ecstatic intensity there does not exist in its nothingness-radiance (*stong-gsal*) any center and periphery.

[87] *chos-sku* . Literally this term means the pattern or gestalt (*sku*) in and through which the whole's meaning (*chos*) expresses itself and is expressed. In this process the whole's nothingness-radiance plays a decisive role by summing up the actualization and fulfilment of a primordial "existential" structure of human being, as indicated by Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa in *Chos-dbyings*, 333. We may elaborate on this existential process by saying that it produces nothing other than itself — the starting-point; if ever there is one, is formally identical with the result, and the result, if ever there is one, contains nothing than what the process had started with, except that the result is more "explicit" than the starting-point, because it has gone "through an infinite", as the German dramatist Heinrich von Kleist once said — similar to the image in a concave mirror; having disappeared into infinity, it suddenly reappears close to our eyes. In Jungian terms the *chos-sku*, could be called the archetype of orientation and meaning. Orientation means human-directedness, and the highest or profoundest meaning is humanity itself. In mythological terms the Gnostic idea of the *anthropos photeinos* (Man of Light, Adam of Light, in German, *der Lichtmensch*) comes closest to the existential experience of what the Buddhists called *chos-sku.*

The (experience of this intensity as its) being-free since time before time[88] and settled in itself, is the assurance about its time-before-time validity in an ultimate sense;

The (experience of this intensity as being such) that, without anything having had to be given up, is, in its entirety and completeness,[89] the assurance about its primordial[90] purity;

The (experience of this intensity as) invariance-spontaneity[91] is the assurance about its being without any ground and without any roots;[92]

The (experience of this intensity as the) auto-dissolution of all that has been ordered (as one's phenomenal world), is the assurance about (its)

---

[88] The term *ye*, occurring twice in this line in the compound *ye-grol* and *ye-grub*, must be clearly distinguished from the term *gdod-(nas)* occurring in the next verse line. The former term refers to a "state" of pure potentiality, "before" time and the beginning of one's actual existence or *Dasein*; the latter term refers to the incipience of one's *Dasein* as a "state" as yet uncompromised by any mistaken concretization.

[89] *ma-spangs yongs-rdzogs*. Traditionally, on the basis of a rigid dualism, that which has to be given up or eliminated are one's emotional and intellectual obscurations. In rDzogs-chen thought they are conceived of as forces in the service of an individual's (spiritual) evolution. This seems to be implied by Padmasambhava's (*Nyi-zla'i snying-po*, fol. 25a) cryptic phrase *ma-spangs grol-lugs* "non-elimination as a mode of becoming and being free". His contemporary Vairocana (*rGyud-'bum*, vol.7, p. 217) commenting on Śrīsiṃha's *Ye-shes gsang-ba sgron-me*, explicitly states "by this non-elimination (spiritual) darkness turns into (spiritual) light."

[90] *gdod-nas.* See also note 88 above.

[91] *mi-'gyur lhun-grub.* Wholeness is "invariant" in remaining wholeness, but this does not imply something static. In its very "nothingness" (*stong*, see above note 86) it is a dynamic openness whose luminous nature (*gsal*, see above note 86) is to make (itself) visible in (its) spontaneous presencing (*lhun-grub*).

[92] *gzhi-rtsa-bral-ba.* For metrical reasons short for *gzhi-med rtsa-bral*. On this phrase see above note 6.

coming-to-presence[93] in an ultimate sense.

[d.][94]

24 Fresh, natural[95], uncontrived[96], normal[97]

This plain cognitive principle, (always) dissolving by itself (into the freedom that it is), is the road of the (spiritually) victorious ones;

(This principle's) auto-excitation (into its supraconscious ecstatic intensity)[98] and auto-dissolution (into the freedom that it is) need not be "fixed" by (extraneous) aids.

In the (spiralling) vortex of this supraconscious ecstatic intensity, (that is) unborn, spontaneous and complete,

Whatever lights up is such as to come as one's friend; here

The source of (one's) going astray into (the fictions[99] of) rejection and

---

93 *rang-shar.* Literally this term means "having risen by itself", *shar* being the past tense of *'char-ba* "to rise". Figuratively speaking, this term describes the end-phase of a process that was already prefigured (not predetermined or predestined) in — if I may be permitted to coin a new term — its "before-timeness" (*ye*).

94 As pointed out in note 69 it is from here on that the analytical summary of contents and the text itself do not tally. This section bearing the same title as section [b.] is said to begin with what in the text can be identified as [f.]. The section translated here bears the same title as section [b.].

95 *gnyug-ma* . Implied is *gnyug-ma'i sems* on which see above note 5.

96 *ma-bcos.* See above note 8.

97 *rang-ga-ma.* Note the emphasis on *rang* "own" — being its own.

98 *rang-rig.* The implication of this term is that to the extent that wholeness is ek-static (*rig*) this Ek-stasis is *its own* ecstasy (*rang*). But this ecstasy/Ek-stasis is also *our own* because we are both the whole and only part of it.

99 For the benefit of the Western reader I have added this word in order to mark the contrast of the genuine (*gnyug-ma*) supraconscious ecstatic intensity with the spurious notions of the intellect.

acceptance has dried up.

Whatever has lit up as good and evil, happiness and sorrow,[100] is the dimension of this supraconscious ecstatic intensity.

(What is this intensity's) ownmost unique ability-to-be-this-ecstatic intensity is (also) the dimension for the play of its originary awareness modes.

The fact that (henceforward) there is no longer any reason for straying into either samsara or nirvana is the greatest miracle.

[e.][101]

25 While (wholeness in its) oneness can account for the being-free of the plurality (of its concrete reality), the plurality (of its concrete reality in its being-free) cannot account for the being-free of (wholeness in its) oneness:

Once you know this to be the case, (you experience for yourself the whole's) auto-dissolution (into the freedom that it) as the

---

100 *shar*. See above note 83.

101 The analytical summary of contents uses the same title for this section as it did for section [c.], but lets it begin two verse lines earlier with a misspelling of *rig* as *rim*. Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa had spoken of the whole's "intentionality" (*dgongs-pa*) in terms of five vortices (*klong*) and five assurances (*gdeng*) — the number five subtly intimating that wholeness (the whole), in order to become comprehensible, presents itself as a *maṇḍala* or centered four. He now speaks of the whole in terms of five vector feeling-tones (*grol*) for which the English language has no equivalent term or terms. The noun "freedom" and its adjective "free" are static terms and hence unable to convey anything of the dynamics in the Tibetan terms. These describe the subtle nuances of a feeling one experiences when everything seems to fall off and dissolve into the whole's nothingness that is the same as its fulness, wholeness, completeness.

This stanza quite literally presents a theme with variations in the sense that the variations are the theme itself which therefore is nowhere else than in the variations. The theme is the whole's dynamic freedom, a process that has been going on with no noticeable beginning and has no determinable locality. It has nothing to do with time and/or space yet makes time and space possible, which is another way of saying that the theme shows up in its variations.

quintessence of the supraconscious ecstatic intensity.[102] (It involves)

The time-before-time being-free.[103] (This means that there) exists no reason to reduplicate (what already is) and (this is what is meant by) "the dimension of (the whole's) beginning;"[104]

The being-free in its perceptible imperceptibility.[105] (This means that there) exists no materiality (as some entity) and (this is what is meant by) "the voidance of anything claimed to be real or true;"[106]

The auto-dissolution (of the phenomenal into the freedom that it is).[107] (This means that there) exists no (extraneous) aid[108] to (effect this

---

102 The following five "specifications" are basically variations of this central theme of freedom from a dynamic and experientially assessed perspective.

103 *ye-grol.*

104 From the Western preeminently static point of view this distinction drawn between "the freedom that (wholeness) has been since time before time" (*ye-grol*) and the freedom that, as it were, turns into the "dimension of the (whole's) beginning" (*gdod-ma'i ngang*) deserves special notice. In this beginning of the whole or of what we may call the origin of the universe of which we are an integral aspect and part, the sheer intensity of the freedom that wholeness has been since time before time becomes its own intense magnitude that in us constitutes our disposition to freedom.

105 *cer-grol* .

106 The "beginning" of which the preceding line spoke initiates another variation in the original theme, a plane of intense nothingness (*cer*) with no fixed identities in it that by their insistence on truth cannot but have a deadening effect. On this plane one's supraconscious ecstatic intensity as a way of seeing allows what it sees to appear in the clearance of its radiance and its gaze "fuses," as it were, with its visionary field. The feeling-tone of this intensity is described in the deeply moving image of a mother and her child; in their love for each other they have only eyes for one another and virtually flow into and dissolve in one another.

107 *rang-grol.* See also note 109.

108 *gnyen-po.* The sNying-thig (rDzogs-chen) thinkers' rejection of any extraneous forces has anticipated the modern idea of the self-organization of living systems.

freedom) and this is) what is meant by "one's natural mind;"[109]

The intrapsychic stirring and (its) dissolution (into the freedom from which this stirring has originated)[110] (This means that it is of) symbolic pregnance in its legitimate dwelling. This "time- and space-binding"[111] (means that)

---

109 This "variation" marks the emergence of the principle of individuation. The process becomes "itself" (*rang*) by itself without any assistance from what is extraneous to it. This "itself" is in us our mind in-its-beingness (*gnyug-ma'i sems*) that precisely because it is not egological, that is, neither ego-centric nor logo-centric, remains autonomously "flexible". The image for this flexibility is a serpent uncoiling.

110 *'gyus-grol.*

111 On this intrapsychic stirring or tremor-like glinting (*'gyu-ba*, past tense *'gyus*) see also above note 82. The term 'gyus-*grol* calls to mind the strangeness of quantum fields in which "particles are continually created and almost immediately destroyed, enjoying only a transient existence in a never-ending effervescence" (B.K. Ridley, *Time, Space and Things*, 108-109). In other words, this tremor-like glinting marks a symmetry break in the original intensity of the *lumen naturale* and sets the scene for the dichotomic structure of thinking, as commonly understood, to come to the fore, to "come-to-light" (*snang-ba*). This process is in its as yet nascent state of structuration a veritable "time- and space-binding." In a stanza (*Chos-dbyings* XI 5, p. 241) that at first glance appears to be rather enigmatic, Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa intimates the dissolution of this tremore-like glinting in the very "moment" of its glinting (*'gyu-thog-tu. grol-ba*) and, by implication, the dissolution of its lighting-up in the moment of its lighting-up:

> One's own most unique ability-to-be (*rang-bzhin*) as the interface (*bar-ma*) between movement and rest abides as an undifferentiated continuum;
> Though not predicable as either joy or non-joy it may come to presence as either and
> Has to be recognized as what it is at the time of its coming-to-presence; since (in its recognition) it is neither (intellectually) rejected or accepted
> It remains settled in itself and as the possibilizing dynamics (of wholeness) with nothing to be differentiated in it and to be eliminated from it
> It is said to be the dissolution of (one's spiritual) darkness into the ultimate *lumen naturale* that we are.

What Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa wants to say is that the Being-that-we-are is the whole's *lumen naturale* whereby we are truly luminous beings, but this light goes unnoticed because of our preoccupation with the joys and sorrows of our ordinary life and from this viewpoint is misunderstood and relegated to the limbo of indistinctness. This fateful disregard of our beholdenness to the *lumen naturale* is prompted by the assertiveness of the nascent dichotomic structure of our ego-centric and ego-logical consciousness that narrowly circumscribes the field of its vision and represses everything that does not suit its whims. In recognizing, that is, experiencing the presence of this light, however dim at first it may be, it is restored to its original

The coming-to-the-fore (of structures) and their dissolution[112] occurs simultaneously, which means that "there exists neither a before nor an after".[113]

---

intensity. Re-cognition means re-intensification. This explication may be gleaned from Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa's own commentary on his stanza and as such turns out to be an accurate phenomenological description of a deeply felt and realized experience. His words are:

> When one's cognitive principle (*shes-pa*) different from both joy and sorrow arises for a brief moment and invites its objectification, one should not look to where it may be objectified in its rising, but recognize it as the insubstantial-intangible spirituality-"stuff" (*zang-ka*) that makes this rising possible. (In this recognition) the simultaneity of the dissolution of this lighting-up with its lighting-up (*snang-thog-tu grol-ba*) without (attempting to repress or) reject what so lights up as the external (world), as well as the simultaneity of the dissolution of the tremor-like glinting with its tremor-like glinting (*'gyu-thog-tu grol-ba*) without (attempting to repress or) reject what so glints as the internal (world), is like what happens when the fastening of the two loads (on a pack animal) is loosened — both loads will simultaneously fall down. This interface cognitive principle thus released (from its load of happiness and sorrow and the strain put in it by them) is (in so regaining its original lucency) said to be the dissolution of (one's spiritual) darkness into the whole's nothingness that is its *lumen naturale*.

[112] *shar-grol*. Its more detailed formula is *rang-shar rang-grol*. Not only does the structuring of light into distinct perceptible patterns occur by itself (*rang-shar*) out of the whole's dynamics that is its lucency, it also dissolves (and thereby regains its freedom, in the narrower sense of the word, from its temporary enframement in a distinct structure) by itself (*rang-grol*). This has been beautifully described by Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa in his *Nam-mkha' rab-'byams*, 397:

> One's own's (*rang-gi*) ownmostness (*rang-bzhin*) that ever and again structures itself (*shar-ba*) anew
> Is like the water and its waves: the dimension of the ocean that is (the whole's) originary awareness modes
> Structures itself into the wave of a supraconscious ecstatic intensity for which there is no ground (other than itself) and which has no roots.
> It surges from out of the dimension of the (whole's) possibilizing dynamics and into it it submerges:
> This self-structuring and self-dissolution (*rang-shar rang-grol*) is the grandiose play of wholeness (in its anthropic) gestalt that is its very meaning (*chos-sku*).

[113] The whole stanza divides into two intertwining sections. The first section comprises the three "variations" referred to as *ye-grol*, *cer-grol*, and *rang-grol* . Their sequence is not accidental, but is descriptive of an individuation process which I will call a *process ontology* of intentionality in evolutionary perspective. The second section comprises three "variations" of which only two are listed and which are indicated by the terms *'gyus-grol* and *shar-grol*, the "middle" phase of this process in which the tremor-like glinting (*'gyu*) is, as it were, "fanned" into its lighting-up (*snang*) before this light becomes the structured-light patterns (*shar*) of our vision.

[f.][114]

26 Do not make an issue of anything anywhere, let that which is non-referential

Roam as it pleases in its self-structuration and self-settling.

Its self-surfacing and self-plummeting defies all attempts to grasp it concretely.

Do not fashion (this openness into some sort of thing) with your intellect; do not suppress the tremor-like glinting.

There do not exist external or internal domains (to arrest the dynamics of this openness whose) dimension is as vast as the sky.

In this dimension that has been a dynamic nothingness since time-before-time[115], your intellect is brought to nothing[116] and an immense

---

This we may call the *ontogeny* of vision. This intertwining of ontology and ontogeny in what is termed intentionality (*dgongs-pa*) and forms the subject-matter of this part of Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa's essay in the form of a poem seems to have anticipated a very modern idea, expressed by Paul Valéry in these words:

> L'univers est établi sur un plan dont la symétrie profonde exist, dans un sens, à l'intérieur de notre âme
> (The Universe is built on a plan the profound symmetry of which is somehow present in the inner structure of our intellect)

and

> J'habite un univers qui exist en moi
> (I am in a world which is in me).

114 See above note 49. According to the analytical summary of contents this section has the same title as [b.] and is listed as [d.], which does not make any real sense.

115 *ye-stong*. Since in rDzogs-chen thought *stong* is a term for a vector feeling-tone for which the English language has no equivalent, I have tried to capture the verbal character of this term by rendering it as "dynamic nothingness".

116 *blo-stong*. Here the verbal character of *stong* is most conspicuous. By bringing to nothing — deconstructing, as we would say nowadays — the intellect with its ego-centric and logo-centric narrowness and rigid closure to what are live processes, the immensity of wholeness

openness prevails;

In this dimension that has done with the phenomena[117], your intellect[118] has done with (its ruminations), — oh, what jubilant joy (you experience)!

[C. Committing the totality of our empirical reality to (the care of) our humanity[119]]

---

in all its dynamics can be "felt" and lived.

117 *chos-zad*. In a sense, the term *zad* points to the culmination of the process that had begun with the "bringing to nothing" (*stong*) the restrictions imposed on the dynamic nothingness of wholeness that now has (finally and completely) done with them.

118 *blo-zad*. Having first brought to nothing the agitations by and ruminations of the intellect (*blo-stong*), one now has completely done with them.

119 *thams-cad chos-skur la-bzla-ba*. We have noted before (see above note 87) that *chos-sku* could be called the archetype of orientation and meaning and that orientation for the rDzogs-chen thinkers like Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa means human-directednesss whose profoundest meaning is humanity itself. Ours, that is, the totality of our empirical reality is a human world that in its this-earthly reality does not exclude spiritual values, hence *thams-cad*, literally "all and everything." At the danger of losing sight of the human *quality* of Being, we might say in terms of philosophy (once meaning "love for wisdom", but nowadays "tossing about opinions and gossiping") that Being is nowhere else than in (the) being(s). There is no such thing as *a* Being over and above or behind being(s). In the words of the Swiss philosopher Paul Häberlin, *Philosophia Perennis*, 50:

> Es gibt überhaupt kein "Etwas" außer den Individuen; ihr gemeinsames "Sein" aber ist allein die Tatsache, daß sie sind. "Sein" gibt es nur als seiende Individualität; man darf es (Sein) nicht hypostasieren
>
> (There is absolutely no "something" apart from the individuals; their common "being" is simply the fact that they are. "Being" exists only as individuality-being/existing; one must not hypostatize Being).

In terms of wholeness we may restate the above and say that wholeness is nowhere else than in its parts whereby they become wholes themselves.

The phrase *la-bzla-ba* is found only in the older literature and not listed in any available dictionary. The "literal" (linguistically reductive) meaning is "to cross a pass," but the phrase is never understood in its literal sense and its modern interpretation is "to be absolutely certain." Since this phrase reflects an experience (*Erleben*), not a logical-rational-epistemological postulate, I have tried to capture its dynamic character by paraphrasing this phrase by such expressions as "committing (something) to (something)" and "handing (something) over to (something)." By such "activity" the experiencer *feels* himself to have "jumped the last hurdle" to bar him from his wholeness.

[a. Handing over the subject-object dichotomy to the ultimate level where no objects exist]

27 What an object is in itself lies beyond the corruption by the intellect,
For what is the intellect's "stuff" there does not exist (anything in the manner of an) object that might shroud it[120].
Do not act (out on it your corrupting notions of) rejection or acceptance, negation or affirmation, expectation or apprehension.

[b. Handing over rejection and that which aids rejection[121] to the ultimate level that is without the intellect (and its interfering with this level]

28 (The whole's) giving birth to thoughts/meanings, unlocalizable, beyond any verbalizability,
Uncontrived, placid, free since time before time
Is not in need of being "fixed" by aids (in order to ensure the rejection of its) external and internal (overlays).[122]

---

120 In the above two verse lines Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa fuses his process ontology with epistemology. The "in itself" (*rang-bzhin*) intimates an actuality or eigenstate into which through a symmetry transformation the whole's energy-intensity-potentiality-"stuff" (*ngo-bo*) has transformed itself. In this its "isness" it just is, "uncorrupted" by the interpretations the egological intellect imposes on it. But the intellect, from the perspective of its energy-intensity-potentiality-"stuff," is just this energy-intensity-potentiality-"stuff" that remains invariant under all its transformations that do not "shroud" it.

121 *spang-gnyen*. While in the preceding stanza Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa had dealt with the rational-intellectual approach to our existentiality with its separation into the observer and the observed (dealt with as an impersonal "it"), he now deals with the emotional approach that, like the rational-intellectual approach, is based on a dualistic premise.

122 The external is our essentially impersonal physical environing world, the internal is the world of our only too personal (ego-centric and ego-logical) emotionality and rationality. All these three "overlays" prescind from the spirituality that we are.

[c. Handing over (one's individual) self-settledness to the ultimate level of (its holistic) there-ness-*cum* -unfolding[123]]

29 Wherever, in his own most unique being-free, the king settles, there is the core intensity of (the whole's) supraconscious ecstatic intensity.

Self-established, unconcerned (with the duality of approval and disapproval) [this intensity occupies] the dimension that can neither be improved nor vitiated.

Spontaneous and spreading this supraconscious ecstatic intensity plays[124] with whatever has arisen (before its gaze) as its cognitive domain.

[d. Handing over one's egocentrically felt happiness[125] to the ultimate level (of happiness that is like the comfort one feels in lying) on one's own bed[126]]

---

123 *lhun-'byams*. Again, two contrary notions (rest and movement) are here fused into a single dynamic one. Stated differently, the whole's ecstatic intensity is pervasive of the whole's field of which it is its excitation and with which it interacts. This does not contradict its Ek-stasis, rather it emphasizes the fact that the intellect with its insistence on the purely material and mechanical as real is incapable of grasping that which lies beyond the limits of its world.

124 *rol*. This reference to play is of singular importance. Not only is play a source of tremendous joy, it also is its own reward. Much later than Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa the German poet Friedrich von Schiller (1759-1805) summed up the value of play in his famous aphorism:

> Der Mensch ist nur wirklich sich selbst wenn er spielt
> (Man is only truly himself when he is at play).

125 *blo-bde*. The choice of the term *blo* is intentional. Usually *blo* refers to the intellect as a function of the ego-centric and ego-logical "self." The happiness (*bde*) that is felt by it is of an agitated, diversionary kind. It does not transport the experiencer into his true *Ek*-stasis.

126 *rang-mal*. With this term the full impact of the "handing over" is brought to light. The happiness that is felt here is one of relaxation and as such alters the character of one's vision. This different and hence more comprehensive visionary character has been admirably brought out by David Michael Levin, *The Opening of Vision*, 463:

> Without the control, the constant, obsessive monitoring of the ego, the seer's gaze is radically decentred, centred in a calm, more restful, more receptive relationship to the openness of the visual field as a whole. This openness, this visual clearing, is what makes the seer's gaze 'ecstatic'.

30 This dimension of graciousness[127] for which one does not have to search, since it is (already) self-established and self-settled,
Marks the end of words and intellection; it transcends the scope of one's sensory capacities.
There is nothing (in it) that can be looked at, there is nothing (in it) that can be imaginatively developed, there is nothing (in it) to which one might point and say "this is it."
Without (feeling the urge to) do something, whilst holding (in oneself) the strength of a simpleton, is (what is meant by) feeling egocentrically happy.[128]

[e. Handing over this openness to the ultimate level (of the whole's openness) that is like (the

---

[127] *kun-bzang ngang*. This term contains an allusion to Kun-tu bzang-po who, as Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa in his *Chos-dbyings*, 214, explains, "is the stuff of which the whole's supraconscious ecstatic intensity is made of", and who is humanity's Teacher (*ibid.*, 44). However, it must not be forgotten that Kun-tu bzang-po, the "active" effectiveness principle (*thabs*) in the ordering of the universe and one's life, is inseparably conjoined with Kun-tu bzang-mo, the "appreciative" intensification principle (*shes-rab*). Only the law of parsimony that rules our language allows us to speak of the one or the other at a time. What the mythologizing expression of Kun-tu bzang-po and Kun-tu bzang-mo keeps apart, the term *kun-bzang* keeps together. This "dimension of graciousness" of which the German poet Johann Wolfgang von Goethe spoke as

Geeinte Zwienatur
Der innigen beiden
(Twin-nature blended
In a single intimacy)
Faust, Part II, *Mountain Gorges* , 11962-63

manifests itself in us when we are perfectly happy with the strength of a simpleton (who can perform deeds of valor precisely because he is unable to think about them in a self-conscious manner and does not feel the urge to do something).

It may not be out of place to point out that the term *ngang*, rendered by "dimension", also has the connotation of "disposition", which is to say that we as human beings are disposed to goodness, graciousness (*kun-bzang*).

[128] This line is taken over *verbatim* from Śrīsiṃha's *Khyung-chen mkha'-lding*, 378.

immensity of) the sky][129]

31 This one's incomparable existential reality in which (the whole's) ubiquitous originary awareness, knowing of no parochialism in the absence of any bias,

Shines unsullied in its own effulgence,

Is not found by searching for it, but is found by a letting-be:

The (whole's) lighting-up by itself (in the wake of an) intrapsychic stirring structures[130] itself into the play[131] (staged by the guiding image) of one's humanity.[132]

From the moment onward of its so having structured itself it remains unaffected by the mire of (the sun and moon's) rising and setting (in the sky).[133]

May through the kindness of the teacher-supreme[134] this understanding

---

129 This last but one phase in the "handing over process" marks the transition from one's openness (*stong*) that is "felt" to be such as all limiting traces of ego-relatedness having disappeared, to a wider openness that, too, is still "felt" to be like the openness (and by implication) immensity of the sky (*mkha'-mnyam*).

130 On these three phases of a tremor-like glinting (*'gyu-ba*), a lighting-up (*snang-ba*), and a structured presence (*shar*) see above note 83.

131 *rol-pa*. On the significance of play see also above note 124.

132 *chos-sku*. On this term see also above note 87. One's humanity is not some immutable absolute. It is evolution and its "play" is the whole's way of guiding us toward individuation.

133 Sun and moon symbolize the effectiveness principle (*thabs*) and the intensification principle (*shes-rab*), both of which operate on the "mundane" level of our embodied existence. The guiding image of our humanity (*chos-sku*) may be said to reach into our enworlded existence, but is not of it.

134 *bla-ma*. The "teacher-supreme" is none else but wholeness itself. The most detailed hermeneutical interpretation of the idea of the "teacher-supreme" has been presented by Padmasambhava in his *sNang-srid kha-sbyor*, fols. 247b-249b.

concretely govern (one's life).

[f. Handing over this level on which one has done with the phenomena to the ultimate level of transcendence[135]]

32 This plenitude of a supraconscious ecstatic intensity, being its own most unique ability-to-be-its-freedom, self-settled, (but)
Not understood by following the ways of the sundry philosophical systems, and
Without the imputations the intellect with its thinking in terms of (ready-made) ideas[136] (attempts to) impose on it, is the miracle (of one's being).

---

[135] *blo-'das*. Literally this term means "passing beyond the intellect". It does not imply some supernaturalism or metaphysical idealism. What this term intends is that the intellect with its ego-logical vision offers only a very limited perspective from which most of what makes life worth living has been excluded and that beyond it lies the whole's life-enhancing wealth.

[136] *yid-dpyod*. In Buddhist psychology *yid* is a "sixth" sensory organ that brings to the data of the other five senses the notion that, for instance, the colored patch I perceive with my eyes is a green leaf, and so on. Counting the *yid* as a separate sense implies that the notion of a "leaf" is not abstracted from the data provided by the visual sense, but added to it.

[Concluding Remarks]

[1. Life's meaning, Being's intentionality that forever prevails due to its supraconscious ecstatic intensity that also is its openness-nothingness (*rig-stong*) and also due to its being the level where the experiencer has done with the phenomena (*chos-zad*) as well as due to the fact of its having been since time before time pure in its symbolic pregnance (*ye-nas dag-pa*) is not something that can be imaginatively developed where everything impeding (its dynamics) has been chopped away (*khregs-chod*),[137] (rather) it is what is (metaphorically) called the whole's own bed (*rang-mal*)]

33 In the soaring of one's contextualized mind into the sky-like spaciousness of its background[138]
Whose dimension[139] is such that in it (what eventually constitutes our phenomenal and noumenal) reality is already fully preexistent[140] and that it goes beyond everything one's ego-logical mind can think of,
There marches the whole's unique information dynamics,[141] independent of any causal momentum and its accompanying modifiers[142].

---

137 On this term see Introduction, p. 5. It does not occur in works that can be dated to have existed before Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa's time.

138 This line is almost untranslatable because of the paucity of our psychological vocabulary. The phrase *yid-kyi dal* which I have rendered by "one's contextualized mind" sums up the contextuality (*dal*) of one's ego-centric and ego-logical thinking (*yid*) that itself is but a sector of a wider field called *sems* "mind" and constituting the background and matrix of *yid*. But *sems*, too, is a sector or, more precisely, a diminution of a wider dimension (*ngang*) that disposes us to be thinking beings.

139 *ngang*. See the preceding note.

140 *gzhi-rdzogs*. See above note 4.

141 *thig-le nyag-gcig*. In the text the order of the two elements in this compound are inverted, thus *nyag-gcig thig-le*. This inversion obviously aims at emphasizing the uniqueness of this dynamics in the first place, and then to intimate the "information" contained in this uniqueness.

142 *rgyu-med rkyen-bral* . See also above note 78.

[2. With the (pre-ontological process-oriented) quaternity[143] having come-to-the-fore as the (ontological) circularity of dynamic wholeness,[144] the (whole's) intentionality, life's meaning, has arrived at (its) dimension of graciousness[145] (and from there its) intense vortex is going to be enshrined in the (whole's) field-like expanse that is complete in every respect]

34 Lighting up by itself in the clear sky that is (the whole's) own most unique ability-to-be and
Nailed down by the big nail of its invariance and self-consistency,
This dimension that overarches the four alternatives (of rational thought) that are neither some thing alight nor some nothing.
It is the ever widening (spiralling) vortex of the visible as a structured nothingness that (potentially) contains everything —
(Through) its own most unique ability-to-be dissolving by itself (into the

---

143 *dus-bzhi*. Literally this term means " a fourfold of time," intimating a geometrization of time that in the Western world with its outward-directed view and attendant concern with theory, in the seventeenth century, led to the invention of logarithms by Napier and the invention of the calculus of fluxions by Newton. See G.J. Whitrow, *The Natural Philosophy of Time*, p. 185. In the rDzogs-chen context with its inward-directed view and concern with lived experience, this geometrization of time comprised, according to Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa, *Chos-dbyings*, p. 309, the understanding that for (the whole's) lighting-up (*snang-ba*) there exists no ground (*gzhi-med*), that for (its) cognitive principle (*shes-pa*) there exists no object (*yul-med*), that for (its) supraconscious ecstatic intensity (*rig-pa*) there exists no (localizable) basis (*rten*), and that for (its phase where) the phenomena have been done with (*chos-zad*) there exists no name (*ming-med*). In his *Bla-yang* II, 84f., Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa discusses the quaternity in terms of an external level (the four seasons), an internal level (the four elemental forces that go into the making of us as physical beings in a physical environment), and an arcane level (our humanity, *chos-sku*). Not being a thing, our humanity presents the paradox of invariance and change such that our humanity, on the one hand, involves a certain capacity or possibility for a continuity of existence — "the single invariance time (that is) wholeness itself in its giving birth to thoughts/meanings (*chos-nyid*)" — and, on the other hand, a triple time that as change is the thoughts/meanings as logical constructs (*chos-can*). Within this quaternity only one quarter (*bzhi-cha*) apart from the three other quarters (*sum-bral*) can be said to be humanity-proper (*chos-sku*). Nonetheless, all four quarters together reflect the fundamental principle of self-consistency (*mnyam-nyid*). Whatever comes into existence (our humanity included) must be consistent with itself and with everything else.

144 *chos-nyid-kyi 'khor-lo*. Both the quaternity and circularity (circle or wheel, *rota*) play a significant role in C.G. Jung's psychology.

145 *kun-bzang-gi ngang*. See also above note 127.

freedom that it is), its spontaneous presence is an ever widening (spiralling) vortex.

[3. Authorship and benediction]

35 The meaning of spanning the four alternatives (symbolically intimated by the title) "The Full-fledged *Khyung-chen* Bird"
Has been discussed by Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa in harmony with (this spiralling vortex of dynamic wholeness after which he has named himself). May through this discourse
All living beings find their wholeness in (this spiralling) vortex from which nothing has been excluded.

Khyung-chen gshog-rdzogs

Tibetan Text[1]

I. Man-ngag-la 'jug-pa rgyu'i don-gyi ngo-bo mdor bstan

a. mtshan-gyi rnam-grangs bkod-pas don-gyi ngo-bo mdor bstan-pa

Khyung-chen gshog-rdzogs

b. bsdus-pa dang rgyas-pa'i phyag-gis gnas-lugs rgyas-par bshad

1 chos-nyid gdal-ba-chen-po-la phyag-'tshal-lo

2 gzhi-med rtsa-bral 'gyur-med gnyug-ma'i sems
3 ma-bcos rgyal-po cog-bzhag *rang*-grol-ba
4 spang-blang dgag-sgrub re-dogs kun-las-'das
5 gzhi-rdzogs sems-nyid ngang-la phyag-'tshal-lo

c. brtsam-par dam-bca'-bas don bsdu-ba'o

6 gdod-nas rnam-dag bsam-yul 'das-pa'i klong
7 sems-nyid rgyal-po *rang*-bzhin rdzogs-pa-che
8 gang yang ma-spangs kun-las 'das-pa'i ngang
9 chos kun *ye*-nas *grol*-ba'i *rang*-bzhin nyon

II. man-ngag dngos-kyi don-gyis rang-bzhin rgyas-par bshad

A. gshis rdzogs-pa chen-po sgom-med chos-zad blo-'das-su thag-bcad-pa

---

[1] Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa's key terms, used singly or in compounds, have been italicized.

1. rim-dgu blo'i theg-pas gnas-lugs ma-rtogs-pa spyir bstan

a. gnas-lugs rig-pa'i ngo-bo bcos-bslad med-par bstan-pa

10 brjod-bral *ye*-rdzogs sems-nyid nam-mkha' che
11 byar-med rtsol-bral dran-bsam kun-las 'das
12 gang shar zhen-med lhun-'byams rig-pa'i klong
13 cog-bzhag *rang-grol* cer-mthong bsam-yul med
14 *rang*-bzhin babs-yin bcos-bslad ma-byed cig

b. de-la bcos-pas 'ching-bar bstan-pa

15 rmongs-pa gang-gis ngo-bo de bor-nas
16 gnyug-ma'i sems-la sgrin-po'i gzeb bskur-te
17 bcos-shing bcos-shing snying-po'i don-la sgrib
18 *grol*-ba med-de de-yis slar 'ching-byed

c. rang-babs bcos-bslad med-pas rtsol-bral chen-por thag-gcad-pa'o

19 gang-la blo-yi khog-yangs lhod yod-pa
20 *rang*-bzhin-nyid-de de-la bcos mi-dgos
21 'gyus-mthong[2] *rang*-dag gnyen-pos ma-bslad-cing
22 spang-byas ma-bsgyur shes de rdzogs-pa-che

2. bskyed-rdzogs blo'i sgom-pas gnas-lugs don-gyi snying-po ma-rtogs-pa bye-brag-tu bshad

a. blos byas rtog-pa'i phreng-bas gnas-lugs-kyi don mi-rtogs-pa bskyed-rim-pa spyir dgag-pa

1. bcos-ma'i bskyed-rim-gyis thar-pa mi-thob-pa

23 yod-nyid med sbyangs med-las yod-pa'i mthar

---

[2] The original print has '*gyur mthong*. Ehr has '*gyu mthong*. The reading adopted here is taken from Śrīsiṃha, 385.

24 dngos kun bshig-pa'i stong-pa nam-mkha' che
25 bcos-shing bcos-shing *grol*-ba 'dod-pa'i mi
26 rtag-chad-nyid-las thar-pa yod dam ci

2. blos sgom 'ching-byed-kyi gzeb-tu bstan-pa

27 gzhi-med rtsa-bral *ye*-nas rdzogs-pa-che
28 stong dang snang dang yod dang med mi-bsgom
29 gang-la sgom yod lta dang spyod-pa yod
30 de-la srid yod 'khor-ba'i sdug-bsngal yod
31 gang-la chos yod theg-pa'i zhe-'dod yod
32 de-la nyon-mongs gzeb yod 'ching-byed yod

3. blo-bral gnas-lugs-kyi dgongs-par thag-gcad-pa'o

33 gzhi-bral lam-'gags 'bras-bu'i zhen-pa zad
34 theg-pa'i 'dod-zhen rdul-tsam mi-gnas-pa
35 de-la las-med rnam-smin gos-pa med
36 srid-zhir mi-gnas nam-mkha'i ngang-du *grol*

b. thabs-shes dmigs-myong-gi 'ching-bas gnas-lugs-kyi don mi-rtogs-par bstan-pa rdzogs-rim-pa bye-brag-tu dgag-pa'o

1. bde gsal mi-rtog-pa thabs dang bcas-pas gnas-lugs-kyi don ma-rtogs-pa spyir bstan-pa

(bde)

37 rtsa dang rlung sbyangs thig-le'i sgrims-sdu dang
38 gnyis-sbyor dbang-po'i bde-ba-la gnas-pa'i
39 dga' dang mchog-dga' dga'-bral lhan-skyes sogs
40 bde dang stong zhes *grol*-ba'i rgyur smra-ba

41 'dod-pa'i khams-las gang-du'ang 'da' mi-nus[3]
42 bcos-ma'i stong-pas *grol*-ba-nyid mi-'gyur

(gsal)

43 sems gsal-nyid dam dbang-po'i sgor snang-ba'i
44 rlung-gi kha-dog yul-rkyen gsal la-sogs
45 mi-rtog-nyid ces bcos-shing sus bsgoms-pa
46 zung-ba'i yul-la 'dzin-pa'i gdeng-bcas-te
47 yul-can yul-gyi 'ching-bas rab bcings-nas
48 gzugs-khams-nyid-las *grol*-ba yod dam ci

(mi-rtog-pa)

49 lus bcos ngag bsdams sems bsgrims rnam-rtog bkag
50 dmigs-bral snang-yul med-pa'i sgom-pa yang
51 gzugs-med-nyid-de mkha' sogs rnam-pa bzhir
52 'khor-zhing 'khor-zhing *grol*-ba nam yang med

2. de gsum khams-gsum so-so'i khams-las ma-'das-pa bye-brag-tu bshad-pa

53 bde gsal mi-rtog srid-gsum so-so'i sems
54 'dod gzugs gzugs-med srid-par 'khor-ba-las
55 *grol*-ba'i skabs med mu-stegs-rnams-la'ang yod
56 'gro-gzhan sems dang khyad-par gang-zhig yod

3. de'i len dgag-par bstan-pa'o

57 'on-te de-dag stong-par sgom zhe-na'ang

---

[3] The original print has *'da'-bar nus*. Ehr as above.

58 bcos-shing bcos-shing stong-par sus bsgoms-pa
59 bzang-rtog-nyid de 'ching-byed gnyen-po'i blo
60 *rang*-bzhin babs-min stong-pas phan ci yod
61 rtog-las rtog-'thud bzang-ngan rtog-tshogs-can
62 da-dung 'khor-ba'i grong-khyer sgrub-byed yin
63 bzang-por rtog gang mtho-ris bde-'gro gnyis
64 ngan-par rtog gang ngan-song rnam-pa gsum
65 rim-gyis 'gro-zhing 'khor-rgyun 'da' mi-nus

3. rgyu-'bras blo'i theg-pas gnas-lugs ma-rtogs-shing slar 'khor-ba'i don bsdu-ba'o

a. gshis rgyu-'bras-las 'das-pa nam-mkha' ltar bstan-pa

66 gang-la bzang-ngan las-kyi rgyu med-pa
67 de-la des bskyed 'bras-bur 'khor-ba med
68 nam-mkha' bzhin-te gang-gis gos-par 'gyur

b. rgyu-'bras bya-btsal-gyis 'khor-bar bstan-pa

69 yul-gyi chu-bor blo-yi gzings-bcas-te
70 dmigs-gtad gru-'dzin 'bad-med rtsol-ba'i mi
71 srid-pa'i rgya-mtshor 'khor-zhing dub-pa-las
72 rnam-*grol* rgya-mtsho'i pha-rol phyin mi-nus
73 gang-la dmigs-gtad sgom-pa'i sems yod-pa
74 rtsol-zhing 'bad-de sgrub-pa de-srid-bar
75 'khor-ba-nyid-las *grol*-ba'i thabs med-do

c. byar-med gdod-ma'i gshis-su bstan-pa

76 yul-gyi mkha'-la rig-pa'i rtsal 'phyo-ba
77 gtad-med rgyal-po 'dzin-med shar-ba'i tshe

78 yul dang yul-can srid-las *rang-grol*-nas
79 dus-gsum 'pho-'gyur med-pa'i ngang-la gnas

d. rtsol-med zad-pa'i dgongs-par bstan-pa

80 rtsol-ba'i dug-gis su-yi snying zin-pa
81 de-la srid-pa'i sdug-bsngal char bzhin 'bab
82 rtsol-med rgyal-po bya-bral blo bde-ba
83 *rang-grol* rgyal-po mnyam-pa'i gdeng rnyed-nas
84 rtog-pa'i 'phro-'du *ye*-shes rol-par 'char
85 de ni gdod-ma'i sar phyin 'khrul-pa med
86 *rang*-byung lhun-grub-chen-po'i dgongs-par phyin

e. bcos-bslad med-pa'i don-la gdams-pa

87 gang-gi yid-la *grol*-ba su 'dod-pa
88 gnyug-ma'i sems-la bcos-bslad ma-byed-cig

f. de'i 'thad-pa rgya-cher dgod-pa

89 bcos-shing bcos-shing de-yis nges-par 'chings
90 ma-bcos rgyal-po lhun-rdzogs rig-pa'i gnad
91 gang-babs ngang-la *rang*-babs *rang*-dga'i sems
92 bya-rtsol ma-byed zang-thal skad-cig-ma
93 gang-yin yin-gyis dgag-sgrub rdul-tsam med
94 'di-yin med-gyis spang-blang tha-snyad-bral
95 gzhi-*grol* lam-*grol* 'bras-bu-*grol*-ba'i ngang
96 *rang -grol* rgyal-po dus-gsum 'pho-'gyur med
97 brjod-med bsam-'das gzhi-rdzogs gnyug-ma'i klong

98 *grol*-ba med-de *grol*-gzhi rdul-tsam med
99 bltar-med mthong-med brda-yis mtshon-du med
100 bsam-yul 'das-te bsam-bya'i dngos-po med

B. dgongs-pa mtha'-grol klong yangs-su 'gag-bsdams-pa

a. dgongs klong-yangs-pa-chen-po'i ngo-bor mdor bstan-pa

101 yod med ma-yin gnyis dang gnyis-med min
102 mu bzhi-las 'das gdal-ba-chen-po'i klong
103 *rang*-bzhin lhun-rdzogs skye-med nam-mkha'i klong
104 gting-mtha' mu-med rin-chen rgya-mtsho'i klong
105 *rang*-bzhin 'od-gsal snang-stong nyi-zla'i klong
106 ma-bcos[4] rgyal-po 'du-'bral med-pa'i klong

b. de'i rang-gnad bstan-pa

107 rgyu-med rkyen-bral *rang*-snang *rang*-sar dag
108 sgrib-bral cog-bzhag *rang-grol* rig-pa'i gnad
109 'gyus-pas 'gags-la snang-bas *rang*-sar *grol*
110 *grol* dang ma-*grol* tha-snyad rmi-lam 'dra
111 rtsa-bral ngang-la *grol*-ba gang-zhig yod
112 'di kun brjod-pa'i tha-snyad tsam-du'o

c. de-las gnas-lugs-kyi gding-tshad bstan-pa

113 rig-pa'i rgyal-po stong-gsal chos-sku'i gdeng
114 *ye-grol rang*-babs *ye*-grub-chen-po'i gdeng
115 ma-spangs yongs-rdzogs gdod-nas dag-pa'i gdeng

---

4 The original print has *ma-spros*. Ehr as original

116 mi-'gyur lhun-grub gzhi-rtsa-bral-ba'i gdeng
117 *rang-grol* cog-bzhag *rang*-shar-chen-po'i gdeng

d. de'i rang-gnad bstan-pa

118 so-ma gnyug-ma ma-bcos *rang*-ga-ma
119 tha-mal-shes-pa *rang-grol* rgyal-ba'i lam
120 *rang*-rig *rang-grol* gnyen-pos bcos mi-dgos
121 skye-med lhun-rdzogs *ye-grol* rig-pa'i klong
122 gang-snang grogs-su 'char-ba'i *rang*-bzhin-la
123 spang-blang 'khrul-pa'i byung-khungs zad-pa yin
124 bzang-ngan bde-sdug gang shar rig-pa'i ngang
125 rig-pa'i *rang*-bzhin *ye* -shes rol-pa'i ngang
126 'khor-'das 'khrul-gzhi zad-pa ngo-mtshar che

e. [?]

127 gcig-gis kun *grol* kun-gyis gcig mi-*grol*
128 de-ltar shes-te *rang-grol* rig-pa'i gnad
129 *ye-grol* bskyar-gzhi med-de gdod-ma'i ngang
130 cer-*grol* ngo-bo med-de bden-pas stong
131 *rang-grol* gnyen-po med-de gnyug-ma'i sems
132 'gyus-*grol* *rang*-sar dag-ste skad-cig-ma
133 shar-*grol* dus-mnyam yin-te snga-phyi med

f. [?]

134 gang-la'ang ched-'dzin ma-byed gza'-gtad-bral

135 *rang*-shar *rang*-babs *rang*-dgar[5] yan-du chug
136 *rang*-yan *rang*-zhig ngos-gzung kun-las 'das
137 blo-yis ma-bzo[6] 'gyu-ba ma-dgag-cig
138 phyi-nang yul-med nam-mkha' lta-bu'i ngang
139 *ye*-stong ngang-na blo stong yangs-pa-che
140 chos-zad ngang-na blo zad nyams-re-dga'

C. thams-cad chos-skur la-bzla-ba

1. gzung-'dzin yul-med-chen-por la-bzla-ba

141 yul-gyi *rang*-bzhin blo-yi skyon-las 'das
142 blo-yi ngo-bo yul-gyis gos-pa med
143 spang-len dgag-sgrub re-dogs ma-byed-cig

2. spang-gnyen blo-bral-chen-por la-bzla-ba

144 gang-la mi-gnas brjod-gzhi kun-las 'das
145 ma-bcos lhug-pa *ye-grol* chos-nyid-la
146 phyi-nang gnyen-pos de-la bcos mi-dgos

3. rang-babs lhun-'byams-chen-por la-bzla-ba

147 *rang-grol* rgyal-po gar-babs rig-pa'i gnad
148 rang-bzhag ltos-bral bcos-bslad med-pa'i ngang
149 lhun-'byams rig-pa gang shar yul-la rol

4. blo-bde rang-mal-chen-por la-bzla-ba

---

[5] The original print has *rang-gar*.

[6] The original print has *ma-gzo*.

150 ma-btsal *rang*-bzhag *rang*-babs kun-bzang ngang
151 tshig dang blo zad dbang-po'i yul-las 'das
152 bltar-med bsgom-med 'di zhes mtshon-du med
153 bya-bral glen-pa'i shugs 'char blo bde'o

5. stong-pa mkha'-mnyam-chen-por la-bzla-ba

154 phyogs-med ris-bral *ye*-shes khyab-gdal-ba
155 ma-rnyog *rang*-gdangs dpe-zla med-pa'i don
156 btsal-bas mi-rnyed gzhag-pas *rang*-rnyed-pa'i
157 *rang*-snang 'gyu-ba chos-sku'i rol-par shar
158 shar-tsam-nyid-nas 'char-nub rnyog-bral-ba
159 bla-ma'i drin-gyis rtogs-pa'i dngos de rgyal

6. chos-zad blo-'das-chen-por la-bzla-ba'o

160 sna-tshogs grub-mtha' lam-gyis mi-rtogs-shing
161 yid-dpyod blo-yis sgro-'dogs dang bral-ba
162 *rang-grol rang*-babs rig-pa'i tshangs 'di mtshar

III. man-ngag rdzogs-pa mjug-gi-don-gyis de gnyis-ka'i don bsdu-ba'o

1. rig-stong chos-zad ye-nas dag-pas rtag-tu khregs-chod don-gyi dgongs-pa sgom-med rang-mal-chen-por bstan-pa

163 gzhi-rdzogs bsam-yul kun-las 'das-pa'i ngang
164 sems-kyi mkha'-la yid-kyi dal 'phyo-la
165 rgyu-med rkyen-bral nyag-gcig thig-le'i 'gros

2. dus-bzhi chos-nyid-kyi 'khor-lor shar-bas dgongs-pa kun-bzang-gi ngang-du phyin-pas klong-chen rdzogs-pa'i dbyings-su bsngo-ba

166 *rang*-bzhin dag-pa'i mkha'-la *rang*-snang-ba
167 mi-'gyur mnyam-pa'i gzer-chen thebs-pa 'di
168 snang-min stong-min mu-bzhi gdal-ba'i ngang
169 rnam-kun stong-pa'i gzugs klong yangs-pa yin
170 *rang*-bzhin *rang-grol* lhun-grub yangs-pa'i klong

3. yongs-su rdzogs-pa mtshan-gyi don gang-gis sbyar-ba rdzogs tshig dang bcas-pa bstan-pa'o

171 khyung-chen gshog-rdzogs mu-bzhi gdal-ba'i don
172 klong-chen rab-'byams ngang-du bshad-pa 'dis
173 'gro kun ma-spangs klong-du rdzogs-par shog

Khyung-chen gshog-rdzogs zhes-bya-ba / byar-med klong-yangs-kyi rnal-'byor-pa **Klong-chen rab-'byams**-kyis / mChims-phu dpal-gyi dben-gnas-su sbyar-ba rdzogs-so

Selected Bibliography

A. Works in Western Languages

Bergson, Henri (1988). *Matter and Memory.* Translated by N.M. Paul and W.S. Palmer. Zone Books, New York.

Casey, Edward S. (1976). *Imagining.* Indiana University Press, Bloomington.

Chuang Tsu (1974). *Inner Chapters.* A new translation by Gia-fu Feng and Jane English. Vintage Books, New York.

Guenther, Herbert (1987). *The Creative Vision.* Lotsava, Novato.

Häberlin, Paul (1952). *Philosophia Perennis.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

Heidegger, Martin (1988). *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology.* Translation, Introduction, and Lexicon by Albert Hofstadter (Revised Edition). Indiana University Press, Bloomington.

Jantsch, Erich (1975). *Design for Evolution.* George Braziller, New York.

— (1980). *The Self-organizing Universe.* Pergamon Press, Oxford.

Jung, Carl Gustav (1963/1968). *Psychology and Alchemy.* Translated by R.F.C. Hull. Bollingen Series XX, Princeton University Press.

Levin, David Michael (1988). *The Opening of Vision.* Routledge, New York.

Reber, Arthur S. (1985). *The Penguin Dictionary of Psychology.* Penguin Books.

Ridley, B.K. (1976). *Time, Space and Things.* Penguin Books.

Whitrow, G.J. (1980). *The Natural Philosophy of Time.* Clarendon Press, Oxford.

B. Works in Tibetan

Collections

rNying-ma'i rgyud-'bum. sDe-dge blockprints, n.d.

sNying-thig ya-bzhi.
Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa. New Delhi 1970.

Vairocana rgyud-'bum. Leh, 1974.

gSung-thor-bu
Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa. Delhi 1973

Works by Known Authors

Klong-chen rab-'byams-pa

mKha'-yang
= mKha'-'gro yang-tig
IN: sNying-thig ya-bzhi. Vol.4-6.

Chos-dbyings
= Chos-dbyings rin-po-che'i mdzod
IN: mDzod bdun. Vol. 2. Reproduced from the sDe-dge blocks. Gangtok, Sikkim 1983.

Theg-mchog
= Theg-pa'i mchog rin-po-che'i mdzod
IN: mDzod-bdun. Vol. 3-4.

gNas-lugs
= gNas-lugs rin-po-che'i mdzod
IN: mDzod bdun. Vol. 5.

Tshig-don
= gSang-ba bla-na-med-pa'i 'od-gsal rdo-rje snying-po'i gnas-gsum gsal-bar byed-pa'i tshig-don rin-po-che'i mdzod
IN: mDzod bdun. Vol. 5

Bi-ma

= Bi-ma snying-thig
IN: sNying-thig ya-bzhi. Vol. 7-9.

Bla-yang
= Bla-ma yang-tig
IN: sNying-thig ya-bzhi. Vol. 1.

Zab-yang
= Zab-mo yang-tig
IN: sNying-thig ya-bzhi. Vol. 10-11.

Nam-mkha' rab-'byams
IN: mKha'-yang. Vol. 1

Khyung-chen gshog-rdzogs
IN: sNying-thig ya-bzhi/Zab-mo yang-tig. Vol. 10.

Chos-nyid rang-grol
IN: gSung thor-bu. Vol. 2.

Sems-nyid rang-grol
IN: gSung thor-bu. Vol. 2.

Padmasambhava

rGyud-kyi rtse-rgyal Nyi-zla 'od-'bar mkha'-klong rnam-dag rgya-mtsho klong-gsal

sGron-ma 'od-'bar

Nyi-zla'i snying-po

sNying-po bcud-spungs

bDud-rtsi bcud-thigs

sNang-srid kha-sbyor

lTa-ba-la shan-byed

(All titles in the sDe-dge blockprints of the rNying-ma'i rgyud-'bum,

quoted by volume and folio numbers)

Padma-las-'brel-rtsal

Nam-mkha' klong-yangs
IN: mKha'-yang. Vol. 1.

Rong-zom Chos-kyi bzang-po
bKa'-bum (handwritten copy, n.pl. n.d.)

gSang-'grel
= rGyud-rgyal gsang-ba snying-po'i 'grel-pa dkon-cos 'grel
n.pl., n.d.

Śrīsiṃha

Khyung-chen mkha'-lding
IN: sNying-thig ya-bzhi/Bi-ma snying-thig. Vol. 8.

(The following works by Śrīsiṃha are found in the sDe-dge blockprints of the rNying-ma'i rgyud-'bum)

Nam-mkha' dang mnyam-pa yi-ge med-pa'i rgyud

rGya-mtsho dang mnyam-pa rnyogs-pa med-pa'i rgyud

Byang-chub-kyi sems khyung-chen-gyi rgyud

Ye-shes gsang-ba sgron-me

Works by Unknown Authors

Byang-chub-sems-kyi man-ngag rin-chen phreng-ba
IN: sDe-dge blockprints of the rNying-ma'i rgyud-'bum